

THE NORTH CENTRAL ASSOCIATION
QUARTERLY

Volume VIII CONTENTS FOR JANUARY Number 3

ASSOCIATION NOTES AND EDITORIAL COMMENTS 295

OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS 301

THE PROBLEM OF ARTICULATION OF SECONDARY SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES . *G.W. Rosenlof* 312

FLOOR DISCUSSIONS ON DR. ROSENLOF'S REPORT 324

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF OBJECTIVES IN THE REORGANIZATION OF SECONDARY EDUCATION
J. E. Foster 333

SOCIAL TRENDS AND TRENDS IN EDUCATION *Charles Hubbard Judd* 338

HOW TO USE THE FINDINGS OF THE NATIONAL SURVEY OF SECONDARY EDUCATION
Leonard V. Koos 347

THE TEACHER AND THE SURVEY IN MUSIC IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS . . . *Annie E. Pierce* 356

THE SCHOOL ADMINISTRATOR AND THE SECONDARY SCHOOL LIBRARY . *B. Lamar Johnson* 362

INDIVIDUAL DIFFERENCES *Roy O. Billett* 366

ACADEMIC MAJORS AND MINORS *Calvin O. Davis* 373

RECORD OF ATTENDANCE AT THE ANNUAL MEETING 393

THE NORTH CENTRAL ASSOCIATION QUARTERLY

Volume VIII

JANUARY, 1934

Number 3

ASSOCIATION NOTES AND EDITORIAL COMMENTS

By VOTE of the Association the next annual meeting will be held in the Stevens Hotel, Chicago, on Thursday, Friday, and Saturday, April 19, 20, and 21, 1934. Last April more than 750 individuals registered for the annual meeting. The names of those in attendance at that time appear in the Attendance Roster which is to be found in this issue of the *QUARTERLY*. Naturally the officials hope that an equally large gathering may be held this year.

OFFICIAL MINUTES

It is customary for the Association to keep a stenotyped report of all official actions taken during the annual session. Some sections of these reports have already appeared in the *QUARTERLY*. The remaining portions of these minutes will be found in this issue.

THE PROBLEM OF ARTICULATION

One of the perennial questions that arises within the deliberations of most educational bodies in America is concerned with ways and means of coordinating the work of the various divisions of our school system and of tying the activities together in a true system. The North Central Association has, throughout its history, devoted considerable time and energy to this problem. Still the question keeps bobbing up. Last year

a committee was raised to study the problem anew and to report to the Association in April. The report of that committee will be found in this issue of the *QUARTERLY*. It is presented under the title "The Problem of Articulation of Secondary Schools and Colleges," and was prepared by the chairman, Dr. G. W. Rosenlof, of the State Department of Public Instruction, Lincoln, Nebraska. The report was read before a joint meeting of the North Central Association and the American Association of Collegiate Registrars, and is based upon the replies made to a series of questions sent out to colleges and secondary schools. Surely all educational administrative officers will wish to read this report.

REPRINTS AND FACULTY RECORD BLANKS

The Editorial Office of the *QUARTERLY* desires to call attention to the fact that it still has on hand a goodly number of recently issued reprints and of the Faculty Record Blanks for colleges. The reprints are entitled (1) Report on Physical Education and Athletics (Stradley), (2) Some Issues Involved in the Revision of Standards (Zook), (3) A New Type of Standard and its Explication (Reeves), and (4) The Product of Higher Educational Institutions (Haggerty). These reprints sell for ten cents each, except the one on athletics (which is

twenty cents). Remittances should invariably accompany orders.

The Faculty Record Blanks are put up in packages of fifty each and sell for \$1.50 one package, \$1.00 each additional package for the paper forms; \$2.00 one package, \$1.50 each additional package for the cardboard forms. The Office has distributed hundreds of copies of these blanks but can supply any demands that are likely to be made.

DR. SUZZALLO DIES

The sudden death of Dr. Henry Suzzallo early in the autumn came as a distinct shock to all his friends. His passing will mean a severe loss to the North Central Association. To be sure, Dr. Suzzallo was never a member of our organization. However, as chairman of the board of trustees of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, and as a member of the Carnegie Corporation and of the National Council of Education, he had in recent years lent his powerful influence to many of the Association's undertakings. Indeed a number of extensive studies pursued by our organization were made possible only through the financial help given by the foundation with which he was connected. The North Central Association mourns his death grievously.

HOLLEY OF OKLAHOMA

Word has been received in the Editorial Office to the effect that J. A. Holley of Oklahoma has returned to the office of the State Department of Public Instruction in that state as Chief High School Inspector. As such Mr. Holley becomes again the chairman of the North Central Association State Committee for Oklahoma. The Association welcomes Mr. Holley back to his old position.

ARTICLES ON THE NATIONAL SURVEY

The original program planned for the annual meeting of the Association in

March 1933 provided for a series of discussions upon the general topic "Practical Application of the Findings of the National Survey of Secondary Education Projects upon the School Systems." Because the March meeting had to be abandoned and because the substituted April meeting was reduced in the scope of its activities these discussions were not held. However the Executive Committee voted that the papers prepared expressly for the occasion should be printed in the *QUARTERLY*. They are concerned respectively with:

1. How to Use the Findings of the National Survey L. V. Koos
2. Music in the Secondary School Annie E. Pierce
3. The School Library B. Lamar Johnson
4. Individual Differences R. O. Billett

All of these papers are printed in this issue of the *QUARTERLY*.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE ACTIONS

A meeting of the Executive Committee of the North Central Association was held in Chicago on Saturday, November 18, 1933. The following are some of the actions of that body that should be of especial interest to the members of the Association generally.

1. An informal discussion of the functions of the Executive Committee in relation to the Commissions of the Association was held. It was voted that in connection with any action taken by the Executive Committee on recommendation of a Commission a motion to reconsider may be made only during the meeting of the Committee which directly follows the meeting during which the action was taken. A motion for reconsideration must be made by a member of the prevailing majority of the meeting during which the action was taken. It was voted, however, that by unanimous consent this rule may be suspended in the case of actions taken by the Executive Committee which pertain to the secondary schools and that the Committee may reconsider the case of a secondary school at any meeting with the unanimous consent of the members of the Committee present.

2. It was voted that those institutions which for a period of more than one year have not

satisfied the conditions for membership in the Association, either by paying a membership fee or, in the case of secondary schools, by subscribing to the North Central Association QUARTERLY in accordance with the provisions made by the Commission concerned, be referred to the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education or the Commission on Secondary Schools, as the case may be, with the recommendation that the membership list and the approved list be made one and the same.

3. An amendment to the Constitution was proposed and the Committee voted to request Dr. Carrothers to prepare a discussion of the question for insertion in the January issue of the QUARTERLY. In preparing this material for the QUARTERLY Dr. Carrothers was requested to make clear that the Committee at this time is not either recommending that the proposed amendment be adopted or that it be rejected. It was the opinion of the Committee that the proposed amendment should be studied carefully by the Commission on Secondary Schools and with special reference to how its adoption would effect the various states in the North Central Association territory.

4. Mr. Carrothers, as Chairman of the Committee on Revision of Standards for the Accrediting of Secondary Schools, gave a report of the progress which is being made by this Committee. The Executive Committee approved of the participation of the North Central Association in a nation-wide study of standards. It was voted to allow in the budget for next year a substantial amount to be used in making such a study.

5. Professor George Carrothers, School of Education, University of Michigan, was appointed by the Committee as the fraternal delegate of the North Central Association to the meeting of the Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools which will be held at Atlantic City on December 1 and 2, 1933.

6. Colonel F. L. Hunt, Culver Military Academy, was appointed by the Committee as the fraternal delegate of the North Central Association to the meeting of the New England Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools which will be held in Boston December 8 and 9, 1933.

7. It was voted that the Atkinson High School, Atkinson, Nebraska, be added to the list of approved high schools in Nebraska as an approved high school since the 1933 Annual Meeting of the Association. (This action was taken on the recommendation of the Nebraska State Committee and the Chairman of the Commission on Secondary Schools.)

8. It was voted to reinstate Ishpeming High School, Ishpeming, Michigan, as an approved high school with continuous accrediting since 1909. (This high school was dropped at the time of the 1933 Annual Meeting because of the fact that the annual dues had not been paid. It was pointed out that the annual dues for this school were not in arrears for a period of more than one year and that, therefore, the school could not be dropped on the grounds that the school was not paying the annual dues.) The Committee also voted to advise the Ishpeming High School that the annual dues must be paid to date if this school is to remain on the list of approved high schools after the time of the 1934 Annual Meeting.

9. It was voted that Raymond Walters, President of the University of Cincinnati, be made a member of the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education in the place left vacant by the resignation of Raymond Hughes.

10. It was voted that Philip C. King, President of Washburn College, be made a member of the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education in the place left vacant by the resignation of Commissioner George F. Zook.

JOHN R. EFFINGER

1869—1933

John R. Effinger was born in Keokuk, Iowa, June 3, 1869. He died in Ann Arbor, June 7, 1933. For forty-five years, as student, teacher, and executive, his life was devoted to the University of Michigan. In 1912 he became Professor of French and Dean of the College of Literature, Science and Arts. Doubtless the University is in many respects a direct expression of his life. His intimate friends on the campus bear witness to this fact. As Dean of the largest and central unit of a great university, he became known and his influence was felt and appreciated throughout the country.

In 1928 he was President of the Association of American Colleges. In his presidential address he told of a visitor to a university who saw a bewildering wealth of material equipment, a huge pile of logs, and asked, "But tell me, where is Mark?" Many who heard that address knew that Dean Effinger was a Mark Hopkins to hundreds of boys at the University of Michigan.

In 1926 he became a member of the Classification Committee of the Association of American Universities. Continuing in that position to the end, he made many inspections of colleges in various parts of the country. Naturally, he became a prolific source of information concerning colleges and educational trends.

Following the organization of the North Central's Commission on Higher Institutions and the adoption of standards and the publication of a list of accredited institutions in 1913, the work of the Commission was done by the entire body at the annual meeting. Dean K. C. Babcock as Secretary passed out reports on colleges for examination by Commissioners who were seated about a long table. Back of them stood or sat interested representatives of institutions under consideration. Proceedings were quite leisurely and informal. The reports in the course of years became so numerous and voluminous and the room became so crowded, and at times the audience so generally vociferous, that it became necessary to come to the March meeting in a better state of preparation and to present a more formal program. Inspectors, instead of reading their reports or presenting them informally directly to the Commission, were required to file them with the Secretary, who came to the meeting with a prepared statement on each institution. Secretaries naturally felt that this procedure imposed on them an inordinate burden and responsibility. Therefore, the Board of Review, later constituted as the executive committee of the Commission, was organized in 1925. Original members of the Board were E. C. Elliott, R. M. Hughes, W. P. Morgan, George Buck, and John R. Effinger, who had become a member of the Commission in 1923. Dean Effinger had been a regular attendant at annual meetings since 1912, but it is for eight years of service as a member of the Board of

Review that the North Central is chiefly indebted to him.

It is the business of the Board to review carefully each college report blank, each inspector's report and to personally confer with representatives of institutions. In the end the Board must face the Commission with a definite recommendation on each institution considered. Long days and nights of labor have been required; also sympathetic and intelligent judgment. Whatever service was required Dean Effinger rendered it promptly, efficiently, and intelligently. No member of the Board can ever forget that he insisted on beginning meetings promptly and on staying until a full quota of work had been done. In meetings he noted all statements and actions. These he remembered and used from year to year. He had a long perspective and a broad horizon. In discussion he was neither verbose nor vehement; quite the contrary. His discussions were clear and firm. One had need of facts to persuade him. It should be remembered, however, that honest intention and intelligent purpose were considerable facts to him. Those who worked with him on the Board will remember his habit of drawing pictures on bits of paper. The completion of a picture usually preceded some such remark as this, "That man is both honest and intelligent." He would speak quietly and with a quality of finality. Evidently he was ready to vote. He was always ready to recognize worth even when unsupported by prestige. In general he was anxious to have the North Central Association mind its own business and not to be influenced by matters which are the proper concern of individual institutions and their constituents.

The North Central Association certainly has good reason to lament the passing of Dean Effinger. His friends mourn his death and rejoice in his life. He won for himself the "durable satisfactions." The great simple things were

his: a moral standard to guide him; a worthy work to justify his existence; family and friends to love and serve.

A PROPOSED AMENDMENT

At a meeting of the Executive Committee, held in Chicago in November, notice was given that a certain proposed amendment to the Constitution would be presented at the April meeting. The Committee voted that this proposal should be run in the January issue of the *QUARTERLY*, with the request than any members who may be interested in expressing themselves relating to it may do so. The pros and cons of the issue have been formulated by the Chairman, the Secretary and the other members of the Commission and are presented here in outline form for consideration. It is hoped that as many members as are interested will vote on the question. The proposal, together with the comments and explanations relating to it, is as follows:

It is proposed that Article IV, Section 5(c) shall be changed to read as follows:

... three executive heads of membership secondary schools from each state within the territory of the Association to be elected by the member schools in each state. One of these members of the state committee shall be elected each year for a term of three years. The Chairman and Secretary of the Commission on Secondary Schools shall outline the plan of procedure for the election, and the state committee in each state shall be in charge of the election.

Comments and Explanations. I. In Favor of the Amendment. 1. The Commission on Secondary Schools should be enlarged so that a greater number of schoolmen will be involved in the work of the Commission and of the Association, and so that a wider spread of Association interest may be generated.

2. Executive heads of secondary schools should be more largely represented on state committees and on the Commission on Secondary Schools.

3. The control of state committees and of the Commission should be in the hands of secondary school administrators rather than of university and state department men.

4. The expense of the proposed election would be small and could be taken care of by the office of the state chairman.

5. Heretofore the Association, by constitutional provision, has elected the secondary school members to the Commissions. This amendment would provide for the election of 60 of the members of the Commission on Secondary Schools by administrators of secondary schools in the different states.

II. Opposing the Amendment. 1. Securing nominations by mail from the 2400 secondary schools and then securing the election vote on these candidates would entail considerable expense and the expenditure of a great deal of time and energy.

2. While the added expense might be taken care of by increasing the fee of each secondary school, this policy seems hardly wise at present.

3. Considerable extra administrative machinery would be added to an already large voluntary organization.

III. Possible Modifications. 1. A better plan for election, if a change is to be made, might be to have the state association of secondary school principals within each state elect the N.C.A. representatives.

2. Should this new Section 5(c) replace both 5(c) and 5(d)? This plan would keep the total Commission membership smaller.

3. Should the added members of the state committee be advisory members only and not voting members?

4. Should the proposed amendment operate optionally on the several states? It is possible that some states may feel that the present arrangement for an advisory member is entirely satisfactory.

The suggested amendment will be up for consideration at the annual meeting in Chicago in April. What do you think of it? Should it be adopted in its present form? Should it be modified (and if so in what ways) and then adopted? What is your opinion? This is an urgent invitation to everyone interested in the welfare of the Association to express his wishes. Please send your comment to the undersigned.

GEORGE E. CARROTHERS, *Chairman*
Commission on Secondary Schools
Ann Arbor, Michigan

THE ASSOCIATION'S BOOK

In the spring of 1933 the Association published an edition of all curricular studies which our society has made during the last ten year. This book is entitled *High School Curriculum Reorganization*. In his review of the book, in the issue of *School and Society* for September 2, William McAndrew says—

A startling statement opens the book of the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools: "It will be agreed that in every instance an underlying social theory or philosophy should furnish the basis for revision of the matter taught in high schools." By all means that should be so, but those who write the books that come to me on high school policies keep saying that the preponderating influence deciding high school procedure is the college entrance requirement not formed on any known social theory or philosophy. . . .

Be that as it may, Wisconsin Professor Willing's exposition of the legitimate objectives of public high schools turns away from the college-loaded reforms of the past, such as The Committee of Ten, and in a diagrammatic outline of fourteen pages, lists, as due the school beneficiary, desirable qualities which nobody can deny. . . .

The compilers are frankly honest in their stand. We used to think, they say, that, if the matter taught was not realizing the objectives of high school, other matter could be found that would. "These assumptions are obviously false and will have to be abandoned. A perfectly futile effort has been educational reform in changing the character of subject matter when no change is possible." Sakes alive! Are these sons of Moses giving up because they find the people dancing around idols of Baal? Not so, for in another more hopeful passage they say, if we stick to the objectives we have chosen it is possible that in the future some effort needs to be made to get rid of the subjects that do not achieve the aim. We must choose those that do. Too much of current educational philosophy, they say, secures the *status quo*.

If this review of the committee's really great book seems in any way derogatory of either, the seeming is wrong. If these men had conceived a high school Utopia their book would have been little more than an educational dream. Taking high schools as they are and definitely suggesting how to make the things taught more worth while, the compilers will reach a large multitude of educational workers and improve what is being done. That these seven sages of the association know what a revolution, as Dewey calls it, must shake the high school, you may see in their sturdy closing chapter, "Points for Further Emphasis."

Recommended: Enrollment of this book in the honorable list of forward steps.

Up to the present time one thousand copies of this book have been sold. It is being sold without profit, the sales price of \$1.50 being merely sufficient to cover the cost of production. From reports that have come to the Editorial Office it appears to be serving a felt need and to be genuinely appreciated. The Table of Contents of this book, together with an order blank for its purchase, will be found at the end of this issue of the *QUARTERLY*.

OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS¹

FRIDAY EVENING SESSION

THE opening session of the Thirty-eighth Annual Meeting of the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, held at the Stevens Hotel, Chicago, Illinois, April 21-22, 1933, convened at eight o'clock, Mr. A. A. Reed of University of Nebraska, President of the Association, presiding.

President Reed: Ladies and Gentlemen—When it became necessary, due to conditions beyond control, to postpone the Thirty-eighth Annual Meeting of the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, it was feared that the attendance would be materially affected by that change. It has certainly been gratifying to know that the sessions of the Commissions today have been beyond the capacity of the rooms, exceeding any attendance in recent years. This means that no matter what other conditions may prevail, the workers in the field of secondary and higher education are keenly alive to their responsibilities and are carrying on in that fine spirit that for thirty-eight years has characterized these volunteer workers in behalf of education.

As you understand, our Association operates through three working organizations, the Commission on Unit Courses and Curricula, the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education and the Commission on Secondary Schools. Each one, in turn, presents to the Association as a whole the results of studies and deliberations, bringing them here for consideration and action by the Association.

It is my privilege and pleasure to present Chairman Deam of the Commission on Unit Courses and Curricula, who

will present the report for that Commission. [Mr. Thomas M. Deam, Joliet Township High School and Junior College, assumed the chair.]

Chairman Deam: President Reed and Members of the Association—As President Reed has told you, the Association functions through three major Commissions. It has been the practice for a number of years, and it has become the custom, for each of these Commissions to take one session and present a portion, at least, of the work which is done in the Commission.

I shall confine what I have to say to reading from three brief articles, setting forth the purposes of our own Commission and the committees working under this Commission.

In the fundamental law of the Association, namely, the *Constitution*, the purposes of the Commission on Unit Courses and Curricula are set forth. I quote from that document. "The Commission on Unit Courses and Curricula shall consist of twenty-four persons, twelve representing the institutions of higher education and twelve the secondary schools, members of the Association; four of each group to be elected annually for a period of three years, on the nomination of the Executive Committee. This Commission shall plan and carry forward research relating to unit courses of study in various subjects and the curriculum in all classes of secondary schools and institutions of higher education included within the Association."

Next I want to read the first paragraph in the introduction to the book which the Commission on Unit Courses and Curricula has prepared this year. This book represents the achievements

¹A Stenotype report of the activities of the Annual Meeting in April, 1933—THE EDITOR.

of many committees working during the past twelve years. The names of these men appear either in the footnote or preface, and I am sure, speaking for the Commission on Unit Courses and Curricula, we are greatly indebted to the great group of men, capable men, who have presented these reports, and especially are we indebted to the particular committee which edited this book.

I am not trying to give a sales talk at all. The printing of this book was authorized by the Executive Committee, and the price for which we sell the book merely covers the cost of printing. The book sells for \$1.50.

The subjects covered in this book are art, music, English, Latin, French, Spanish and German, general science, biology, chemistry, physics, mathematics, social studies, home economics, health and physical education, extra-curricular activities. Materials for these subject fields were worked out, as I said, by subcommittees.

Here is the first paragraph in the introduction of this book. "The Commission on Unit Courses and Curricula, when it was organized, represented an extension of the function of the North Central Association. Up to that time no attention, apparently, had been given to curriculum, and in its efforts to assist in standardizing colleges and secondary schools it seems that the function of this Commission was to promote standardization in the field of curricula. The actual work of the Commission, however, has been much more limited than its title indicates, since it has not extended its efforts beyond the field of secondary education. Whether it was the intention to cover the field of higher education as well is not clear; but it may be assumed that such was the case, since two commissions, one on higher education and one on secondary schools, had operated to cover the two fields, while this Com-

mission had nothing in its title to indicate that it was not to cover both types of institutions included in the membership of the Association. But, whatever the original intention may have been, the efforts of the Commission have been confined to secondary education."

Let me read further from Chapter III of this book. The chapter is entitled "Using the Association's Curriculum Materials." It reads,

"Can the North Central Association develop curriculum materials usable by the schools of the Association? There is evidence that it can in cases where teachers regard the materials as suggestive rather than prescriptive. Doubt of this possibility has been expressed usually by educators who, thinking of the widely varying types and sizes of the schools and of the differences in teacher ability and training, have supposed that the Association's purpose was to set up a uniform course of study. If such were the Association's purpose, doubt concerning it would be justified. But the curriculum offerings prepared by the Committee on Standards for Use in the Reorganization of Secondary School Curricula, and published by the Association have never been intended to serve as detailed or exclusive courses for North Central schools. They have been intended merely as aids in the preparation of school courses."

For the past three or four years this particular Commission has exhibited the types of work which it has been doing by having presentations made by two speakers. We have tried to change the subject of these talks from year to year and have been changing, usually, the men who presented these papers. Tonight we have two exhibits. The first of these exhibits is presented by Dean J. E. Foster of Iowa State College, and the subject is "The Significance of Objectives in the Reorganization of

Secondary Education."¹ [Dean Foster then read his paper.]

Chairman Deam: The title of the second exhibit is "Units of Work in Secondary School Mathematics." The paper is to be given by Professor Raleigh Schorling, of the University of Michigan.² [Professor Schorling then read his paper.]

[President Reed resumed the chair.]

President Reed: I am sure that all who have heard the presentation of the progress made by this Commission on Unit Courses and Curricula as presented by President Deam and the two representatives of the Commission desire that we should give expression of our deep appreciation of this splendid volunteer work. Certainly this is worth while at a time when high schools are receiving students in numbers beyond the wildest dreams of any former age, when promotion into high school is by force of gravity, when the demands for material that can be used by different types and different levels of students is so great. This is certainly a distinct and helpful contribution.

I desire at this time to announce the names of the Committee on Nominations appointed in advance of the meeting because of the condensed time:

President T. M. McMichael, Monmouth College, *Chairman*

President Edwin B. Dean, Doane College
Dean Roy Gittinger, University of Oklahoma
Inspector J. T. Giles, State Dept. of Public Instruction, Wisconsin

Assistant Superintendent J. L. Shouse, in charge of High Schools, Kansas City, Missouri

Also the Committee on Auditing, to audit the Treasurer's report:

Superintendent Thomas W. Gosling, Akron, Ohio, *Chairman*

High School Visitor H. D. Trimble, University of Illinois

Principal Charles Coons, Gary, Indiana

President Reed: We will now hear the report of the Executive Committee presented by the Secretary, A. W. Clevenger. Mr. Clevenger read the report.¹

President Reed: We will now hear the report of the Treasurer, Principal E. H. K. McComb, Indianapolis, Indiana. Mr. McComb read his report.²

Mr. I. N. McCash, Enid, Oklahoma: I move that the report be received, placed on file, and referred to the auditing committee.

President Reed: We will hear at this time the report of the Committee on Nominations, President T. M. McMichael, Monmouth College, *Chairman*.

Mr. T. M. McMichael: Your Nominating Committee, charged with the nomination of President, First and Second Vice Presidents and two members of the Executive Committee, would present the following for your consideration:

President: H. M. Wriston, Lawrence College, Appleton, Wisconsin

First Vice President: B. L. Stradley, University Examiner, Ohio State University

Second Vice President: Lieutenant Colonel A. M. Hitch, Kemper Military School

Members of the Executive Committee:

I. N. McCash, President of Phillips University, Enid, Oklahoma

Fred L. Teal, Superintendent of Schools, Charleston, W. Va.

In behalf of the Committee I would move the adoption of this report.

President Reed: This report will lay on the table until the meeting tomorrow afternoon. In the meantime other nominations are in order by members of the Association on the written nomination of ten members.

You find on the program before you the closing address, "How to Use the

¹This paper appears in this issue of the QUARTERLY.—THE EDITOR.

²This paper will appear in the April issue of the QUARTERLY.—THE EDITOR.

¹As published in the QUARTERLY for June, 1933.—THE EDITOR.

²As published in the QUARTERLY for June, 1933.—THE EDITOR.

Findings of the National Survey of Secondary Education."¹ This address has been prepared by Professor Leonard V. Koos, School of Education, University of Chicago. Professor Koos has been unavoidably called from the city, and his colleague, Professor W. C. Reavis, will present the address for him. I take pleasure in presenting Professor Reavis.

Professor W. C. Reavis: Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen—Professor Koos requested me to express his regrets

at his inability to be here. I have studied his paper carefully and I will endeavor to read it acceptably. [Professor Reavis then read the paper.]

President Reed: As you leave the room tonight you will receive material that has been presented to us on behalf of Dr. Koos by his colleague, Professor Reavis.

We thank you, sir, for your assistance.

The meeting is adjourned until tomorrow morning.

OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS—LUNCHEON SESSION²

THE meeting convened at one-five o'clock, President A. H. Upham, Miami University, First Vice President of the Association, presiding.

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS BY MR. UPHAM

Most of you are accustomed to the technique of Rotary and Kiwanis clubs. You know what it is for everybody to be in a hurry, for a speaking program to begin before the eating program has been finished. I believe it was Josh Billings who said once that "'Tain't the things a man don't know that makes him a fool, it's the things he does know ain't so."

You have no idea how little you know about the printed program and the real program for this luncheon today. There have been so many changes made in this program that when I came in here a little while ago only the Lord and I knew who the real speakers were going to be. Now I have some struggle in believing in the omniscience of the Lord.

In the first place, this isn't even a luncheon. It is billed as a luncheon but it isn't a luncheon. It is an economy ban-

quet. Or, if you prefer, it is a depression banquet. Various elements of economy are involved, you see. In the first place, the price of a luncheon is a little bit less in most well regulated hotels than the price of a dinner. In the second place, there is a certain saving in the laundry bills of people who are persuaded to sit at the speakers' table. They don't have to wear evening clothes. Then, we are utilizing another element of economy today in that we are drawing upon our fraternal delegates who we hope come here at the expense of the associations that send them to furnish the speaking program. We aren't out anything for that.

I think it was a poor little rich girl who was playing at the home of some neighbor and came back and told her parents, with much surprise, that that was a strange household over there, they used their own mother for a cook. Our plan here is that we use our fraternal delegates for speakers.

The first speaker whom you see announced on your printed program isn't here. New England is always restrained and conservative, and, under the influence of the depression, they could not find anybody in New England who would venture this far away from home.

The second speaker announced on

¹This paper is printed elsewhere in the QUARTERLY.—THE EDITOR.

²The morning session of this day was devoted to reports from the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education. These proceedings were published in the June QUARTERLY.—THE EDITOR.

the program is also not here, but he has a pinch-hitter here for him, so that the South is represented—the South, the region of soft and courteous speech, the region of fine phrasing. I never know whether the courteous speech and the fine phrasing of the South is acquired by the negroes from the whites or by the whites from the negroes, but they always have the correct way of putting things down there.

It was in one of those Southern banks that an old negro was paid a bill that was owing to him. The banker looked out through the wicket and said, "Sam, you had better deposit that money right now."

Sam said, "No suh, I don't think I'd better. You know, I put some money in a white man's bank once before and when I come around to get that money, what do you suppose he said to me. He said, 'Sam, you ain't got no money here because the interest on that money done et up the principal.'"

In many regions of the South the interest on their deposits has eaten up the principal, but they are still cheerful and still carrying on. We have, to represent the Southern Association today, Dr. T. J. Wilson of the faculty of the University of North Carolina.

MR. WILSON'S REMARKS

Mr. Toastmaster, Ladies and Gentlemen—The Association is not saving a great deal of money on my speech because I am not going to make very much of a speech.

I merely wish to say that I am very glad to be here and also to say in behalf of the Southern Association that we are always glad to come to your meetings and more than glad, also, to have you come to ours.

I don't believe that anyone could have been treated better anywhere in the world than I have been treated here. I

have been permitted, through the graciousness of the officers of the Association, to get an inside view of almost all the activities that are carried on here. I shall report that, of course, to my association next December when we meet in Nashville, Tennessee.

For myself, I wish to thank the officers of the Association and all of you for your extreme courtesy and kindness to me at all times. I don't know that I have ever enjoyed a visit to Chicago more. I have not been sandbagged, shot at, robbed, nothing of the sort has taken place, largely due to your very great courtesy and kindness and protection.

As a member of the Southern Association, I wish to thank you again and to express the hope that as many of you as find it possible, will in the future, come to see us.

MR. UPHAM'S FIRST INTERPOLATION

The third of our fraternal delegates announced on the program is also not here. There is, however, a substitute present from the Northwest Association but the officers of the Association for the last hour have been busy staging that little drama introduced by the French entitled "Cherchez la femme." We haven't as yet succeeded in finding the lady. If Miss Ireland is anywhere within hearing distance, I wish she would come forward and be introduced. I don't blame her for not coming to eat at this table but then it is her time to speak. Miss Elizabeth Ireland, State Superintendent of Public Instruction from Montana, has been here during the sessions of this organization and has taken active part in those sessions. For some reason or other, she has failed to get here.

Now we come to a part of the program on which we can deliver. The Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools of the Middle States is adjacent to New York City. They are in position to know

what is going on. They are right next to the big, red, throbbing heart of things, so when it is necessary to have a representative, desirable to have a representative at some meeting out in the West here, they are ready to send him out to tell us how things are going, yet I am not sure but what out here in the Middle West we come as near having the secret of the real financial situation as they do anywhere, even in New York.

The other day, on our campus at Miami, some people heard a conversation that was taking place between two of our colored janitors in regard to the present situation. The one who is the janitor of the auditorium, hears all the faculty speeches and is better informed than anybody else around the place, held forth something like this: "De real trouble nowadays is dat there's too much of this over-prediction and currency infatuation, and that is what brought about the statue quo."

The other fellow said, "That's all right, Sid. I can understand them first words but what do you mean by that statue quo?"

He said, "Man, you ought to know that. Ain't you a janitor around a college campus? 'Statue quo' is Greek for this mess we's in."

If our speaker should announce the subject that we have for him on the program, in some of our cities (I am not so well aware of what will happen in Chicago), if this were announced down in Cincinnati I am quite sure the newspapers there would seize upon it with great gusto and they would editorialize to the effect that here is one man who knows what he is talking about. "If only these people who have to do with intellectual things would practice a little economy, the country would be in very much better condition."

It is a real pleasure to introduce at this time and to present in a region where

he has spent many happy and useful years, President William Mather Lewis of Lafayette College, who is our next speaker.

MR. LEWIS'S REMARKS

Mr. Toastmaster, President Reed and Members of the Association—I come before you with great humility after the apology of the Toastmaster for the program of this noon. It took my mind back to the time during the war when I was associated with the Treasury Department, and the Secretary of the Treasury sent me down into Ohio to make a speech which he did not wish to make. When I got into the town I discovered, much to my surprise, that I was the first number on the first so-called lecture course that they had ever had in the town. I was led to the platform of the church by the local minister, and, after gazing with him for a time into the icy faces of an audience which was present because it had season tickets, he arose and introduced me thus: "As you know, this is the first number on our first lecture course. We have never had anything of this kind in the church before." Then he said, "But we have this man here tonight, and if you like him we will try to get a better one next time."

I certainly hope for the North Central Association that your finances are in such shape next year that you can have a real program.

I would also make inquiry, after Dr. Reed's inquiry to those in the edges of the room, if they could hear me except for the experience which a friend of mine had when addressing a group of Boy Scouts a little while ago. One of the Boy Scouts in the back of the room yelled out, "Will you speak louder?"

A little fellow down in one of the front seats turned to him and said, "Can't you hear the speaker?"

The fellow in the back said, "No."

"Shove over. I'm coming back and sit with you."

You will appreciate the strength of that incident a little more in an hour or so than you do at the present moment.

I am very happy to be here as the fraternal delegate of the Middle States and Maryland Association and to bring our very sincere greetings. Dr. Grizzell, who usually comes to these meetings of the North Central Association and who is Chairman of our Commission on Secondary Schools, wished me to extend our felicitations to the Commission on Secondary Schools and our congratulations to the Committee on Unit Courses because of the success of their plan to publish the results of their labors on curriculum making.

May I say in regard to a subject which has been discussed in these meetings a great deal, the matter of the National Survey of Secondary School Education, that no one who has even casually glanced over the report of that survey can have any but a feeling of the deepest admiration for this tremendous work that has been done. In that connection, the entire educational world has been put in debt to the North Central Association for first promoting this plan, to the Office of Education of the Department of the Interior for organizing it and promoting it, and to Dr. Koos for so admirably leading in what I think is going to do more for our educational system than anything which has been done up to this time. Were any proof needed that education in the United States today is not static but is exceedingly progressive and alive, this survey would furnish it.

I have been asked to discuss something along the line of economies, and I have chosen as my subject the matter of intellectual economy because that is the only economy I could think of that we haven't practiced up to the present time.

Most of us have learned, as never before, the fine art of doing without, at least I am speaking of the eastern part of the country. They say down in my part of Pennsylvania that times are so hard, even people who don't expect to pay for their goods aren't buying them any more.

The maid at our house, who happens to live out, came in Thursday morning and said to the colored boy who works around the house, "Well, isn't it terrible that we have gone off the gold standard?"

The boy said, "That don't affect me. I've never been on the gold standard."

I think that is true of most of us. But, on the other hand, we have faced what are really very trying, very tragic situations in education. I suppose there is no institution here which has not been touched in some way or another by it.¹

MR. UPHAM'S CONCLUDING REMARKS

You see, in arranging our program for this luncheon we were simply exemplifying President Lewis' point that if you will practice economy carefully, you will get unusually fine results.

A few years ago when I was out in the West we happened at one time to have a Jewish Governor in the state where I lived. The old wheeze at the time he was inaugurated was, they were taking all the electric lights out of the State House and were putting in Israelites. But during his term as Governor, Vice President Marshall came through on a visit to the West and stayed in the capital over the weekend. It occurred to our good Governor that here was a splendid opportunity to do the honors of the state. So he discovered that Vice President Marshall was a Presbyterian. He had two front pews reserved in the Presbyterian church in the city, the best in the city. He ar-

¹The remainder of Dr. Lewis's address was published in the September, 1933, issue of the *QUARTERLY*, pp. 227-33, under the title, "Intellectual Economies."—THE EDITOR.

ranged to escort officially Vice President Marshall to the Presbyterian services. Everything went fine. They got in in good time. They made a great impression on the large congregation that assembled, and everything went all right until the contribution boxes started to go around. The Governor wasn't quite sure what was to be done under those circumstances. He was sitting at the end of the pew. As the box came to the end

of the pew, he arose, with a large bill in his hand, bowed politely to Vice President and his staff and said, "Gentlemen, your money is no good here. This is on me."

I am just the Vice President of this organization. I have nothing to do with the treasury, but I am quite sure that we can say to this fraternal delegate that his money is no good under these circumstances; this is on us.

OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS—SATURDAY AFTERNOON

THE meeting convened at two o'clock, President Reed presiding.

President Reed: Ladies and Gentlemen—We come now to the closing meeting of this Thirty-eighth Annual gathering of the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. The time of the program is given in the main to the Commission on Secondary Schools. It gives me pleasure to present at this time Dr. G. E. Carrothers, the Chairman of this Commission. [Dr. G. E. Carrothers assumed the chair.]

Chairman Carrothers: The first matter of business this afternoon is that of the report of business transacted by the Commission on Secondary Schools, by Mr. H. G. Hotz, University of Arkansas, Secretary of the Commission.¹ [Mr. H. G. Hotz read the report of the Commission on Secondary Schools.]

Chairman Carrothers: Is there any question you would like to raise or any discussion relative to this report before we continue with the program?

At a joint meeting of the Collegiate Registrars and the North Central Association in this hotel the other day a very interesting report was given by G. W. Rosenlof, State Department of Public Instruction, Lincoln, Nebraska. That report, in part, will be given here this

afternoon. Summaries of some of the findings are now being distributed. I have pleasure in introducing Dr. Rosenlof.

Dr. G. W. Rosenlof: Mr. President, I think it is extremely appropriate that just at this moment we take cognizance of the fact that the speaker who spoke so eloquently at the meeting held in the dining hall during the noon hour should have stressed some of the very matters and problems concerning which some of the members of the Commission on Secondary Schools have interested themselves during recent weeks.

His own belief in the matter, together with the arguments which he there referred to, are certainly an added indicative factor of the responsibility that attaches at the present moment to the administrative leaders of both our secondary schools and colleges. The very things which this gentleman referred to are, in part, perhaps, included in the introductory remarks which I had planned to utilize. However, I shall be very brief in referring to one or two thoughts and then center attention entirely upon the statistical information which is in your hands. [Dr. Rosenlof read his paper.¹]

Chairman Carrothers: Thank you, Dr. Rosenlof.

¹This report was printed in the June, 1933, issue of the QUARTERLY.—THE EDITOR.

¹This paper appears elsewhere in this issue of the QUARTERLY.—THE EDITOR.

Before the program is turned over to the President of the Association I should like to make one or two announcements and a brief explanation. During this year I have been increasingly reminded of the fact that in my early years I thought of the Creator as sitting up there and watching me and marking things down in the book, as one always hindering me. Later I saw that Supreme Being in a different light. I am not making a comparison in entirety, but for a number of years I thought of the North Central Association, as some people do yet apparently, as an organization that hinders. But as I have come to know what is being done, I am sure that the Association is a stimulation, a help, a sort of inner urge toward getting better work done, and I want to mention briefly some of the things that happened in the Commission on Secondary Schools as well as in the Executive Committee that indicate that to me.

In the first place, a year ago, fearing that Standard 8 might not be fully met, the Secondary Commission, on the approval of the Executive Committee, agreed to waive Standard 8 on the average enrollment in the school in excess of a number, when other Standards had been met.

During the year provision was made for the assignment of a teacher outside of her special field of preparation, for a minor portion of the day if an emergency situation existed, in order that the school might not be handicapped. Likewise, as you heard this morning, the Committee decided to waive Standards where they were wholly violated or violated entirely on account of the economic situation. That is an indication to me that the Association is anxious to help in the progress in every way for the improvement of education, and also to take immediate and definite steps wherever possible to avoid handicapping them.

I have appreciated very much the opportunity this year, President Reed, to work with you and the other members of the Association, and I want particularly at this time to express my appreciation for the work of Secretary Hotz of the Commission on Secondary Schools. I hope that whenever another Chairman is appointed he may have an experienced, interested, hard-working official such as Secretary Hotz to carry the burden of the operation. I appreciate the opportunity I have had. [President Reed resumed the chair.]

President Reed: I desire on behalf of the Association to express our deep appreciation of the work of Dr. Carrothers and of this Commission on Secondary Schools.

At this time we will hear the report of the Committee on Time and Place of Meeting and also additional action by the Executive Committee, by the Secretary, Mr. A. W. Clevenger. [Secretary Clevenger read the report of the Executive Committee.¹]

President Reed: The next order of business is the election of officers. The Committee on Nominations reported and laid upon the table, by action of the Association, the following nominations:

For President: H. M. Wriston, Lawrence College

For Vice Presidents:

First: B. L. Stradley, University Examiner, Ohio State University

Second: Lieutenant Colonel A. M. Hitch, Kemper Military School

For the Executive Committee:

I. N. McCash, President of Phillips University, Enid, Oklahoma

Fred L. Teal, Superintendent of Schools, Charleston, W. Va.

No other nominations have as yet been filed. Does anybody desire to file, as you have a legal right to do, nominations on petition? What is the pleasure

¹This report has been incorporated in other reports and has already appeared in various parts of the QUARTERLY.—THE EDITOR.

of the meeting? [It was regularly moved and seconded that nominations be closed, and the Secretary cast a ballot for the list presented by the Nominating Committee.]

President Reed: It is moved and seconded that the Secretary be asked to cast the ballot of the Association for the names as presented, as officers for the ensuing year. Are there any remarks? If not, those in favor of the motion will make it known by saying "aye"; opposed. The motion is unanimously carried.

In the absence of the Secretary the Chair will declare the ballot cast for the officers so named.

Is there any other business to come before the meeting at this time? Let me call your attention to the addresses that appear at the bottom of the program. According to the original plans, a session was to have been given to the study of secondary education. When it became necessary to condense the time of the meeting it seemed necessary to omit that part of the program, since that was not one of the regular Commissions and since we could have time for only the three regular Commissions. Therefore, the Executive Committee authorized the publication of these addresses as a part of the program in order to make the story of the year complete and to bring to you these messages in the *QUARTERLY* at the proper time during the year.

I desire, on behalf of the Association, to express our deep appreciation of the efforts that these members have made and to thank them for the preparation of the papers which will appear in due time in the *QUARTERLY*.

May I announce, also, that in connection with the address which we are about to have, the Committee has authorized the purchase and distribution of printed material covering the related field, which will be given to you as you leave the room at the close of the meeting.

The next order of business is the introduction of the new officers. Is President-Elect Wriston in the room at this time?

It is a great pleasure to welcome you here and to say that the Association has the utmost confidence in your leadership during the coming year.

President-Elect Wriston: This is at least a solvent institution. It is one which has many interesting problems to work on, and it has enough criticism and opposition to keep us humble. It ought therefore to be an interesting and profitable year.

President Reed: The Committee to audit the Treasurer's report has presented a written report which Mr. Trimble will read for the Committee. [Mr. H. D. Trimble read the report of the Auditing Committee.¹]

Mr. H. D. Trimble: I move that this report be accepted. [The motion was regularly seconded.]

President Reed: You have heard the motion. Are there any remarks? If not, those in favor of the motion make it known by saying "aye"; opposed "no." The motion is carried.

The judgment of the Executive Committee in placing upon the program today as the last speaker a name that never fails to secure and hold an audience has been confirmed by the splendid presence here this afternoon. I know of no one whose appearance upon the program awakens a more general response and a finer spirit of appreciation than that of Dr. Charles H. Judd, Dean of the School of Education of the University of Chicago, who will now address you upon "Social Trends and Trends in Education."

Dr. Charles H. Judd: Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen—The President has already called your attention to the

¹This report appeared in the June, 1933, issue of the *QUARTERLY*.—THE EDITOR.

fact that there will be available for you at the end of the session copies of a publication which I think will be of interest to all of you. The United States Daily and the New York Times published early in January summaries of a publication which I think can properly be described as one of the major contributions of recent years to the social sciences.

President Hoover organized a committee which, in turn, organized a staff of workers that prepared two volumes known as *Recent Social Trends in the United States*. Those volumes repre-

sent a bringing together of a great variety of facts with regard to the changes that have taken place in the social as well as the governmental and economic life of the United States in recent years.¹

President Reed: Ladies and Gentlemen—I am sure that this inspiring address of Dr. Judd's is a splendid climax to three days of hard work, careful planning, and intensive efforts made in behalf of this Association. The Association is adjourned.

¹The complete address of Dr. Judd is printed elsewhere in this issue of the QUARTERLY.—THE EDITOR.

THE PROBLEM OF ARTICULATION OF SECONDARY SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES¹

G. W. ROSENLOF

State Department of Public Instruction, Lincoln, Nebraska

IT WAS peculiarly significant that a joint conference with the American Association of Collegiate Registrars was arranged for Thursday evening of this week and at which time there was given an opportunity for the presentation of the data recently collected relating to the problem of articulation. All are agreed that the members of the registrar's association would and, properly so, should be interested in any matters relating to the improvement of plans and policies concerning student admissions and institutional articulation.

It is appropriate that we recognize at the outset that articulation of secondary schools and colleges involves far more than the establishment of proper bases for student admissions. It is indeed unfortunate that in so many instances—far too many to contemplate—that articulatory arrangements have in the main concerned themselves with the matter of admissions of students upon the basis of the completion of certain specific subject matter requirements or of the completion of so many units of subject matter generally recognized as peculiarly appropriate to the secondary schools and presumably of such significant importance as to be required as prerequisites to matriculation in college or university.

That emphasis in the past has been too much concerned with getting into college via the route of subject matter courses and units of credit goes without saying.

As Dr. Learned stated in his paper, "Admission to College,"

As a visible turning point in an American Youth's educational career, admission to college probably outranks any other event, both in the mind of the candidate and in the popular estimate, to which he is not immune. It puts the seal of seriousness on his cultural aspirations or at least fixes the social atmosphere in which he hopes to move.

With Dr. Learned we would agree that this undue emphasis relating to the problem of "getting into college" has very truly and definitely become of such "concentrated importance" as to put an altogether disproportionate value upon the "notion and activities of admissions in relation to the intrinsic worth of these matters in a rational scheme of education."

I am sure it is not necessary here to review the discussion of Dr. Learned's paper or any of the other splendid contributions set forth in the *Educational Record* for January, 1933.

In view of this situation would it not be a matter of real significance to the development of an integrated program of education extending from the elementary grades through college were we to enlarge our concept of articulation so as to include more than the act of "being admitted"?

It is not out of place, perhaps, to note that the basic consideration of any plan of articulation is after all that of discovering—if that be possible—those elements which it is deemed necessary that a student experience in advance of college entrance, in order to best profit by the college training that is sought and

¹A report of a joint conference with the American Association of Collegiate Registrars, meeting at Stevens Hotel, Chicago, April 20, 1933.—THE EDITOR.

desired. As stated by President McVey of the University of Kentucky, "The real problem was to find out in advance those students who were able to profit by a college experience." To continue with President McVey's thought, "This is a problem that challenges all the ability and all the machinery of the schools and the colleges, themselves. The public high schools cannot work out a plan themselves, nor can the private schools go a great way without the help of the colleges."

It was the hope of your President, Dr. Reed, and of your speaker to set up a series of questions which in their very nature would not only reveal something of the "status quo" but would stimulate those to whom these questions were directed to do some rather serious and constructive thinking for themselves on the matter.

The problem which confronts us can best be stated in these words which appeared upon the inquiry blanks:

There is a widespread belief that the secondary schools are being hindered in their efforts to make certain curricular adjustments that the principals feel would broaden the usefulness of their schools and that would permit them to serve better a large and ever increasing number of students not now receiving a maximum benefit because of the limitations placed upon the schools in their efforts to meet college entrance requirements. It is further claimed that this is placing an unwarranted burden of expense upon the schools. If these claims are true, the condition should be speedily remedied. If they are wrong, this false impression should be corrected at the earliest possible moment.

In an endeavor to secure a partial answer, at least, to this very important problem, a series of questions to be answered by both the leaders in secondary schools and the colleges was prepared and sent to these various officials. Because of the shortness of time available for this particular investigation, it was deemed inadvisable to attempt anything

like an exhaustive study. We have had to content ourselves with merely a brief survey of a few of the outstanding problems that are being confronted, leaving to a future period a more comprehensive type of investigation into the many detailed phases of these larger problems of articulation.

This report is, therefore, not to be considered as in any sense representative of finality. It can mark only the beginnings. It can only point the way and perhaps determine in a measure the direction to be taken in any future investigations.

Attention is first of all called to the figures relating to the sources of the data. All told 1290 persons in public high schools and 100 persons in private high schools responded. These persons are scattered throughout the twenty states in the North Central area. A few replies were received from other regional areas. Furthermore, schools of all sizes from the standpoint of enrollments are represented. Sixty-four per cent of the replies came from administrative officers in public high schools of 500 or less enrollment. Eighteen per cent of our replies came from schools enrolling more than 1000 pupils. As is to be expected the North Central schools made the largest showing in returns.

Let us proceed then to an investigation of the data made available in response to the several questions. We shall treat them in the order of their sequence in the inquiry blank.

PART I. THE SECONDARY SCHOOL POINT OF VIEW

1. *Do you feel that at the present time you are being hindered in making desirable curricular adjustments because of having to meet the subject requirements of*

(a) *Your state university?*

(b) *Other educational institutions within your state? or*

(c) *Educational institutions in other states?*

In response to each of these three groups of institutions it is seen that from 33 to 38 per cent of the principals in public schools replied "yes" and from 19 to 27 per cent of the principals in private schools said "yes." On the other hand from 62 to 67 per cent of the public school officials said "no," and from 73 to 81 per cent of the private school officials said "no." Strange as it may seem, more difficulties are seen in the case of the state university within the state and other educational institutions without the state. Private school principals reported less difficulty with the state university of their own state than with any other higher institutions.

Obviously, those who answered "no" to the above question had experienced little or no difficulty whatever in building their secondary school curricula to fit the needs and objectives of their own institutions, irrespective of any articulatory relationships.

Those answering "yes" to the first question were having difficulties. To discover these was, therefore, the purpose for Question 2.

2. *If there were no subject-matter requirements for college entrance, would you increase, decrease or change materially the nature of your offerings (in the several fields mentioned)?*

Of the public school principals indicating increases in subject matter offerings in the several fields, it is seen that the largest numbers and naturally the largest percentages would welcome increases in course offerings in the fields of Industrial Arts, Fine Arts, Health Education and Social Sciences, the first mentioned ranking highest (85 per cent), the last mentioned ranking fourth (79 per cent). These were followed in their order by Natural Sciences, English, Mathematics and Foreign Language.

Only 13 per cent suggested increases in course offerings for Foreign Languages. In view of so much discussion as to the place of languages in the secondary curricula it will be considered as rather remarkable that a percentage as high as this has been revealed.

In the case of the private school principals, the four subject matter fields that seem to stand out as the favored ones to be given a larger place in the secondary school program we find in their order Health Education, Fine Arts, Industrial and Social Science. These persons, it is seen, give Health Education first rank, whereas the public school people would place it third. There seems also to be a closer unanimity as to Industrial and Fine Arts and as to the ranking of the Social Sciences as a subject for increased consideration.

Of the public school officials desiring to see decreases in the several fields of subject matter we find Languages (as would be expected) placed first with Mathematics second and English third. It is to be noted that the position of these three subjects is in exact reverse to that of those who would recommend increases in subject matter offerings for these three fields. There is again a lesser percentage of principals of public schools desiring to decrease the offerings in such subjects as Fine Arts, Health Education, Social Sciences and Industrial Arts.

The principals of private schools were in accord with public school officials in stating that decreases in course offerings should be made first of all in Foreign Languages. Second in rank was Mathematics. Eighty-seven per cent of the private school officials favored decreases in Foreign Language offerings and 83 per cent favored decreases in Mathematics offerings. A lesser percentage of these persons recommended decreases in English than in any other field. The Industrial Arts ranked next.

Finally, turning to those who would recommend material changes in the curricula, we note the public high school principals placing Mathematics first as in need of material change in course offerings with the Foreign Languages ranking second. Social Sciences are found to rank third and closely following that is the field of the Industrial Arts. The field of English apparently occupies the favored place in that only 13 per cent of the public high school principals would recommend any material changes.

As for the private school principals they seem to think that the Industrial Arts courses are less in need of material change, with Health Education coming next and Fine Arts, third and English, fourth. A larger percentage of these officials feel that the Foreign Language offerings, more than any other, demand material change.

Summarizing, it is very evident that Foreign Language and Mathematics offerings are the least favored of all. Of greater importance are the Industrial and Fine Arts, Health Education and Social Sciences followed by the Natural Sciences and English. English is the one field that is apparently least in need of material change so far as the public school officials are concerned. The private school people are somewhat in disagreement as to this last mentioned subject, having, by their answers, placed Industrial Arts in this category with Health Education not so very far behind.

3. *Does the present situation call for maintaining small classes to meet certain college entrance requirements, thus increasing the cost of education beyond what would be necessary if you made the curricular changes indicated by your answers to Question 2?*

Forty per cent of the high school principals replied in the affirmative and 59 per cent replied in the negative. That is to say, four out of ten, approximately,

felt that the present situation does call for the maintenance of small classes to meet certain college entrance requirements and thus increasing the costs of education beyond what they would be if curricular changes, such as those suggested under Question 2, could be made. Conversely, six out of ten, approximately speaking, did not feel that this was the case at all.

It would seem, therefore, if we may be permitted to make a deduction from the foregoing, that present entrance requirements so far as specific subject matter requirements are concerned have not seriously increased burdens of educational costs.

4. *Would it be a distinct advantage to your school if the colleges were to abandon*

(a) *A fixed number of units for college entrance?*

(b) *Specific subjects for college entrance?*

Eighty-four per cent of the public high school principals and 85 per cent of the principals of private high schools stated that there would be no distinct advantage accruing to their schools were colleges to abandon the practice of requiring a fixed number of units for college entrance.

The practice of requiring specific subjects for college entrance is a practice subject to considerably more question, for 57 per cent of the principals of public high schools and 34 per cent of the principals of private high schools reported that there would be a distinct advantage in abandoning specific subject matter requirements. The expressed attitude of these people with respect to this matter is reflected very definitely in their responses to Question 2.

As a further check upon the attitudes of these school officials the next two questions reveal some very distinct trends. Let us turn to these.

5. If your answer to Question 4 is "yes," would you favor admission to college on the recommendation of the principal

- (a) Following graduation from high school?
- (b) Irrespective of graduation?
- (c) Including standardized comprehensive examinations administered by the college?
- (d) Including a psychological test administered by the college?
- (e) Including cumulative individual records covering the period of the student in the secondary school attended and submitted to the college authorities?

The replies to this particular inquiry furnish us with an almost immediate picture. First of all, it is to be noted that only one person in six (about 16 per cent), practically speaking, would favor admission to college upon the recommendation of the principal irrespective of graduation from the secondary school. Both groups of officials—those in public high schools and private high schools as well—are in agreement on this point. Conversely, there seems to be little doubt as to the importance which attaches to the completion of the secondary school program as evidenced in the practice of issuing a graduation credential. Almost 80 per cent stated that admission requirements should prescribe graduation from a secondary school.

Much importance attaches to the giving of a psychological test and a comprehensive examination by the college authorities. Apparently, the secondary school people put more reliance in the psychological examination than they do in the comprehensive type of examination.

Not many of the principals of private high schools cared to express themselves upon this particular matter; none, in fact, expressed themselves respecting a psychological test.

Although a lesser number of public school principals expressed themselves as to the value of a cumulative record of each individual, covering the entire high school career, than expressed themselves upon the matter of a graduation requirement, there was, nevertheless, a greater degree of unanimity on the part of these two groups of principals. In fact, there is more unanimity upon this point than upon any other included in this investigation. Eighty-seven per cent of the public school officials and 88 per cent of the private school officials reported favorably upon the desirability of a cumulative record to supplement the principal's recommendations.

6. We turn next to those who replied in the negative to Question 4, that is, those who felt that *it would be a disadvantage to drop subject matter requirements as well as a fixed number of units for college entrance*. By far the largest percentage favored basing college entrance upon the student's records in the last two years of high school. Sixty-five per cent of the public high school officials and 61 per cent of the private high school officials so indicated. A considerably greater percentage favored the submitting of the student's records covering the last three years of high school, as can be noted from the tabular data in your hands.

More than one-half of this group (54 per cent) reporting for the public high schools and, strangely enough, 82 per cent of the officials in private high schools who see no particular disadvantage in giving up specific subject matter requirements and a specific number of units for college entrance, would, drop all subject matter requirements that are not (or cannot be conceived to be) specifically prerequisite to courses which a student will pursue in college.

A final consideration in connection with this phase of our investigation reveals that almost 70 per cent of these

persons favored putting admission upon the basis of graduation from the secondary school or upon the recommendation of the principal, leaving to college authorities the assignment of students to college classes by means of tests in subject matter administered by the college authorities. More than one-half (55 per cent) of the private high school authorities favored this plan.

The last question asked of the secondary school principals was:

7. *Should the public high school give less attention to meeting college entrance requirements?*

In response to this question, 68 per cent of the public school and 43 per cent of the private school officials answered in the affirmative. That is to say, two out of each three replying felt that we should give less attention to this particular phase of our problem of articulation.

In summarizing the findings as reported in the foregoing it is only fair to conclude that while approximately one-third of our responses indicated some feeling that local school officials are being hindered somewhat in making desirable curricular adjustments because of having to meet subject matter requirements, there is, so far as has been revealed in this study, no ground for believing that there is any widespread feeling of hindrance.

On the other hand, those who so felt were rather preponderantly of the opinion that adjustments looking to a lessening of emphasis upon Foreign Language, Mathematics and English were in order. Increased attention, it is shown, might well be given to course offerings in Health Education, the Fine Arts, Industrial Arts, and the Social Sciences.

From the standpoint of educational costs, approximately 60 per cent of our people were of the opinion that educational costs were not being increased because of subject matter requirements.

Again the weight of evidence is preponderantly favorable to the feeling that there is an advantage in fixing the number of units for college entrance while the evidence favorable to fixing certain specific subject matter requirements seems to have a slightly better than fifty-fifty chance with those of the opposite view.

There is apparently a growing feeling that the principal's recommendation after graduation plus a cumulative record covering the senior high school years plus the setting up of certain psychological and comprehensive tests by college authorities should afford a desirable basis for college entrance.

Concluding this phase of the inquiry, we would find that secondary school principals are free to admit the desirability of a lessened emphasis in the matter of college entrance requirements.

PART II. THE COLLEGE POINT OF VIEW

The second phase or part of our inquiry relates itself to the attitudes of the college deans or instructional administrators.

As was indicated on the blanks which were sent out, it was the committee's desire or purpose to discover, if possible, the extent to which college officials could reorganize or had already organized their curricula without doing violence to their degrees and yet permit of adequate adjustments to conform to the position of the secondary schools as revealed in this inquiry. What do we find to be the case?

1. *Could you reorganize curricular plans so as to safeguard your degrees and permit such changes as:*

(a) *Basing admission to classes in freshman English upon a qualifying test that would permit reasonable classification of the students upon the basis of their proficiency in English?*

(b) *Granting a degree without Foreign*

Languages or allowing the requirement in Foreign Languages to be a part of the college course?

- (c) *Granting a degree without requiring college mathematics or offering a one-year college course in Mathematics that would prepare the students for the present beginning course in college Mathematics?*
- (d) *Organizing the beginning course in college science so as to require specific courses in the secondary school as a prerequisite?*
- (e) *Admitting students to college classes in the Social Sciences without assuming the knowledge of any specific courses in the secondary school?*

Here are five definite questions relating to the problem of specific subject matter requirements. Shall we look at these in the order of their presentation?

There is an almost unanimous agreement to set up a qualifying test in English that will permit of a reasonable classification of students upon the basis of proficiency in English as revealed by such a test. In fact, it will be noted that 88 per cent of the teachers college deans, 92 per cent of the junior college deans or department heads, 94 per cent of the Arts college people and 95 per cent of the technical school people reported that they would be favorable to such a proposal. That is to say, 93 per cent of those replying, and there were 2.49 such responses, stated their position in the affirmative on this matter.

There is no such agreement, however, with respect to the Foreign Language requirement. Only 54 per cent of those replying indicated a favorable attitude toward granting a college degree without Foreign Language having been required either in high school or college. There was a greater unanimity of thought favorable to this position on the part of the junior college officials. Less than half of the arts college people (48

per cent) were willing to favor such action.

However, when one turns to the second half of this question we find that 85 per cent of these officials are in favor of allowing the requirement as to Foreign Language to become a part of the college course if and whenever such a requirement has not been met on the secondary school level. The technical school executives were divided on this matter, only 55 per cent being favorable to the proposal. This is in large part explained by comments of some deans of technical schools who pointed out that there was less freedom in the matter of electives in their curricular arrangements and that any irregularities in the secondary school prerequisites were the occasion for serious interference with the orderly sequence of subject matter courses essential to definite technical purposes. It would seem that there is greater freedom allowed in the curricula of arts colleges and other institutions of that type for making possible the securing of those cultural subjects on the college level which have not been recorded as a part of the student's secondary school program.

Turning to the matter of mathematics requirements on the college level, we discover that 77 per cent of the persons responding reported that they would favor granting a degree without requiring any college mathematics. In fact, many colleges are now granting degrees to persons whose records do not show the completion of any college mathematics. There was a greater degree of agreement favorable to this position on the part of the junior college people. On the other hand, as would be expected, the technical school people are not so willing to admit the desirability of this practice. The reasons are obvious and need not here be discussed, suffice to say that some significance might here attach to the fact that about one-third of these per-

sons would favor granting a degree without reference to whether a student had met a college mathematics requirement or not.

There is apparently a very divided sentiment as regards the advisability of organizing a one year preparatory course in mathematics on the college level to precede the present beginning course in college mathematics now found in practically all of our institutions of higher learning. But 6 per cent of the technical school people favor this. On the other hand, about three-fourths of the teachers college and junior college people indicated a favorable attitude to this proposal, with the sentiment of the arts college people being divided fifty-fifty. It will, no doubt, be a very surprising revelation to many of you that there is so large a group now willing to make an admission such as that set forth above, especially in view of the fact that there has been but a slight degree of discussion of this particular subject.

On the contrary, 86 per cent of the responses received were favorable to the suggestion of organizing beginning courses in the sciences which would not require any prerequisites on the secondary school level. Again the technical school people are not so ready to admit of the desirability of this suggestion, less than half (40 per cent) of the number who replied being at all favorable to the proposal. There was a unanimously favorable response on the part of the teachers college group, with the junior college officials being a close second, and the arts college people falling in line right behind them.

About the only difference of attitude respecting the social sciences as compared with that relating to the sciences, so called, is that there is a greater degree of agreement as between the several groups of institutions from which our replies came. Eighty-four per cent of all the deans and instructional adminis-

trators favor admitting students to college classes in the social sciences without assuming the knowledge of any specific courses in social sciences on the secondary school level.

2. *If you could assume maturity and a basis of the successful study of a well balanced secondary school curriculum under intelligent guidance, would you be willing to base your admission requirements upon the recommendation of the principal (of the high school) without regard to*

- (a) *Graduation from the secondary school, or*
- (b) *The number of units completed in the secondary school?*

The replies to these two queries indicate a very definitely divided opinion. Slightly more than one-half of the respondents (54 per cent) favored admission upon these grounds without regard to graduation. The junior college people showed by their replies less concern for the technical requirement of graduation than did any of the other three groups; 60 per cent of the technical school people gave evidence of a similar attitude, whereas the sentiment was practically half and half favorable and unfavorable on the part of the arts college and the teachers college groups.

Less than half (47 per cent) of the replies were favorable to a disregarding of the number of units completed in the secondary school. The data show a very considerable minority of the teachers college people and the arts college people as favorable to a disregarding of the number of units completed. The junior college group is not nearly so opposed to this matter, with the technical school group reporting about 60 per cent favorable to ignoring the number of units of entrance credit completed. It is probable that the technical school group is more concerned with the specific prerequisites for their own curricular requirements than they are for the general

secondary school background as expressed in terms of entrance units.

3. *Upon the recommendation of the principal, would you be willing to admit a student upon the basis of a*

- (a) *Standardized comprehensive examination administered by your institution?*
- (b) *Psychological test, administered by your institution, or*
- (c) *Standardized, cumulative record from the school last attended, to be interpreted by your officials?*

The evidence here presented reveals that college deans would place considerable confidence in the value of a comprehensive type examination as a basis for admission of students recommended by secondary school principals as being prepared to do college work. Eighty-one per cent of the entire number reported affirmatively. As between the four groups of persons reporting, those in the technical schools and teachers colleges stood first in favoring such a plan as a partial requirement to admission to institutions of higher learning. The arts college group is the least so inclined.

When it comes to the matter of a psychological test the attitude of our college people is not nearly so favorable. In fact, less than half of the number would favor a psychological test as one of the bases for determining the eligibility of students to enter upon a college course. The teachers college group, it is to be noted, were more agreeable to the use of a psychological test—83 per cent replying in the affirmative. It should be said, in passing, that only two-thirds of this group replied to this question. Just why one-third failed to reply, is, of course, unknown. Here is a field for some speculation, perhaps. The psychological test, however, has apparently not proven itself as a satisfactory means for determining a student's eligibility to admission to college or university. This is true certainly so far as these data reveal.

A much larger percentage of the college deans and instructional executives favor the furnishing of a cumulative record from the school last attended, the same to be interpreted by college admission officials. Practically speaking, three out of four of those replying were willing to admit students upon the recommendations of the principals, this recommendation to be supplemented by a cumulative record.

Suggestions indicating some combination of the foregoing plans of admission or some other plan of admission exclusive of specific academic examinations were requested. However, there were so few who made any suggestions of a sort considerably different from those already discussed as to make it quite unnecessary to take more time for their consideration here. Suffice to say that in a few instances there were suggestions to require a combination of the recommendation of the principal plus two or more of the elements set forth in the previous question.

One of the university deans made the following rather unusual suggestion:

A period of probation of one term should determine the fitness of college students to carry courses regardless of his earlier training. This does not imply the lowering of standards, but would admit students of unusual ability to a great many classes from which they are now barred because they cannot meet requirements.

I believe that it should be possible for a mature person with a reasonable amount of high school work as preparation to be admitted unclassified until he has proven his ability to do college work and then not hold him for high school credit deficiencies.

Quality of work is far more important than the completion of a specified number of units. Graduation from high school with good grades and with completion of those foundation studies necessary for success in the college curriculum desired is an adequate requirement.

Turning now to the concluding question put to the college group, we find that no more than 10 per cent of those replying felt that the graduation standards of their respective colleges have been

lowered in any degree as a result of any changes thus far made in their plans for admission, which changes had been made by reason of pressure put upon them by the secondary school authorities. No one of the sixteen representatives of technical schools felt that such had been the case so far as their schools were concerned. Inasmuch as the percentage of persons feeling that standards have been lowered is so small it has not been thought necessary for us to bring to attention the very limited number of replies made by this group in explanation of their stand.

What then are we to conclude from the foregoing discussion of the point of view of the college officials?

First of all, these persons are willing to agree upon the matter of utilizing the results of comprehensive type examinations in English for purposes of classifying students. Again, slightly less than half of them are willing to grant degrees to persons who have met no language requirements on either the college or high school level. The great majority of them are perfectly agreeable to allowing students deficient in high school language the opportunity to meet that deficiency on the college level and receive college credit therefor. The technical school group was less favorable to this proposal than was any other group.

In the third place, more than 75 per cent of these people would favor granting a degree without requiring college mathematics. Slightly more than 50 per cent of them favored a preparatory course on the college level as prerequisite to the present beginning course in mathematics and presumably permitting college credit for the same. The great majority reported that they were favorable to organizing beginning courses in science which would not presuppose a secondary school course in science as a prerequisite. Similarly, these would favor a like procedure as regards the social sciences.

We must conclude, too, that in addi-

tion to being favorable to a lessened emphasis upon subject matter requirements, per se, that these persons are ready to accept students upon the basis of favorable recommendations by high school principals supplemented by a cumulative record of high school achievements plus some type of standardized comprehensive test or examination administered by the college authorities, themselves. Psychological tests are not so strongly advocated as a basis for college admissions.

And, finally, they are all, with the exception of a very small handful, free to admit that their college standards are not to any degree at all being lowered because of any pressure brought to bear upon them by the secondary school people. We must conclude that they are willing to go all the way practically in conforming to the reasonable demands or expectations of the secondary school principals. Certainly few can, in the face of these findings, take any steps whatever in asserting their own position as to college entrance requirements, when such position is contrary to the expressed wishes of the rank and file of our secondary school leaders.

Here then is a challenge to the leadership of our secondary school workers. Never in the history of education in America have there been so many evidences of so hopeful a nature.

This study indicates clearly a remarkable agreement as to the desirability of certain important changes regarding the better articulation of the secondary school and the college. The attitude of deans and of others responsible for instructional administration shows an almost entire willingness on the part of the college officials to cooperate fully with the secondary school principals in the development of a sane and scientific program that has for its purpose the establishment of finer relations between the secondary schools and colleges.

SUMMARY OF REPLIES TO THE QUESTIONNAIRE

PART I—THE SECONDARY SCHOOL POINT OF VIEW

To Principals of Secondary Schools:

1. Do you feel that at the present time you are being hindered in making desirable curricular adjustments because of having to meet the subject-matter entrance requirements of

Yes. No. (a) Your state university?

.38*	.62	(1253)
.19	.81	(97)

Yes. No. (b) Other educational institutions within your state?

.33	.67	(1110)
.20	.80	(94)

Yes. No. (c) Educational institutions in other states?

.38	.62	(1052)
.27	.73	(97)

If your answer to any part of Question 1 is "Yes", answer Question 2.

2. If there were no subject-matter requirements for college entrance, would you (1) increase, (2) decrease, or (3) change materially the nature of your offerings in the following fields?

(a) English		Increase		Decrease		Changes	
Yes	No.	Yes	No.	Yes	No.	Yes	No.
.36	.64 (192)	.37	.63 (385)	.13	.87 (117)		
.36	.64 (11)	.12	.88 (9)	.38	.62 (26)		

(b) Foreign Languages		Increase		Decrease		Changes	
Yes	No.	Yes	No.	Yes	No.	Yes	No.
.13	.87 (117)	.88	.12 (422)	.58	.42 (262)		
.37	.62 (26)	.87	.63 (9)	.73	.27 (15)		

(c) Mathematics		Increase		Decrease		Changes	
Yes	No.	Yes	No.	Yes	No.	Yes	No.
.28	.72 (122)	.83	.17 (314)	.60	.40 (353)		
.01	.00 (3)	.83	.17 (18)	.53	.47 (15)		

(d) Natural Sciences		Increase		Decrease		Changes	
Yes	No.	Yes	No.	Yes	No.	Yes	No.
.55	.45 (209)	.26	.74 (109)	.29	.71 (316)		
.78	.22 (9)	.43	.57 (7)	.42	.58 (19)		

(e) Social Sciences		Increase		Decrease		Changes	
Yes	No.	Yes	No.	Yes	No.	Yes	No.
.79	.21 (287)	.17	.83 (88)	.44	.56 (325)		
.80	.20 (15)	.50	.50 (2)	.56	.44 (18)		

(f) Industrial Arts		Increase		Decrease		Changes	
Yes	No.	Yes	No.	Yes	No.	Yes	No.
.85	.15 (217)	.20	.80 (76)	.42	.58 (251)		
.82	.18 (11)	.13	.67 (3)	.17	.83 (12)		

(g) Fine Arts		Increase		Decrease		Changes	
Yes	No.	Yes	No.	Yes	No.	Yes	No.
.83	.17 (270)	.12	.88 (61)	.35	.65 (229)		
.86	.14 (14)	.33	.67 (3)	.31	.69 (13)		

(h) Health Education		Increase		Decrease		Changes	
Yes	No.	Yes	No.	Yes	No.	Yes	No.
.81	.19 (301)	.13	.87 (73)	.33	.67 (249)		
.91	.09 (11)	.50	.50 (12)	.23	.77 (13)		

Yes. No. 3. Does the present situation call for maintaining small classes to meet certain college entrance requirements, thus increasing the cost of education beyond what would be necessary if you made the curricular changes indicated by your answers to Question 2?

.40	.59	(1014)
.22	.77	(65)

*This reads: 38% of 1,253 principals in public schools and 19% of 97 principals in private schools answered "yes."

4. Would it be of distinct advantage to your school if the colleges were to abandon

Yes. No. (a) A fixed number of units for college entrance?

.16	.84	(1118)
.15	.85	(98)

Yes. No. (b) Specific subjects for college entrance?

.57	.42	(1215)
.34	.65	(90)

5. If your answer to Question 4 was "Yes," would you favor admission to college on the recommendation of the Principal?

Yes. No. (a) Following graduation from the secondary school?

.78	.22	(612)
.76	.24	(34)

Yes. No. (b) Irrespective of graduation?

.16	.84	(467)
.24	.76	(29)

Yes. No. (c) Including standardized comprehensive examinations administered by the college?

.63	.37	(530)
.67	.33	(27)

Yes. No. (d) Including a psychological test administered by the college?

.77	.23	(537)
0	0	0

Yes. No. (e) Including cumulative individual records covering the period of the student in the secondary school attended, submitted to the college authorities.

.87	.13	(517)
.88	.12	(26)

(f) Some combination of the above (Indicate same)

Suggestions by 125 public and 8 private schools.

6. If your answer to Question 1 was "No," would you favor some such change as:

Yes. No. (a) Basing college entrance upon the last two years of the secondary school?

.35	.65	(462)
.39	.61	(52)

Yes. No. (b) Basing the college entrance upon the last three years of the secondary school?

.59	.41	(511)
.45	.55	(50)

Yes. No. (c) Dropping all subject-matter requirements that are not specifically prerequisite to courses which the student will carry in college?

.46	.54	(545)
.18	.82	(49)

Yes. No. (d) Admission to college on evidence of graduation from the secondary school or upon the recommendation of the Principal, leaving to college authorities the assignment of students to college classes by means of tests in subject matter administered by college authorities?

.69	.30	(559)
.55	.45	(51)
(e) Comment, 170.		
(e) Comment, 11.		

Yes. No. 7. Should the public high school give less attention to meeting college entrance requirements?

.68	.32	(1083)
.43	.57	(62)

Distribution of States

Ariz. 26;	Ark. 21;	Col. 46;	Ill. 182;
		Col. 1	Ill. 31.
Ind. 68;	Iowa 75;	Kan. 77;	Mich. 103;
Ind. 1	Iowa 4	Kan. 3	Mich. 9
Min. 50;	Mo. 58;	Mont. 26;	Nebr. 144;
Min. 6	Mo. 11		Nebr. 4
N. M. 21;	N. D. 26;	Ohio 134;	Okl. 26;
N. M. 2	N. D. 1	Ohio 14	Okl. 1
S. D. 29;	W. V. 53;	Wis. 77;	N. M. 21;
S. D. 1	W. V. 1	Wis. 7	

Other Associations 26; Total 1290.

Other Associations 3 Total 100.

Distribution by Size

Under 200, 29%; under 500, 35%; under 1000, 18%; 1000+ 18%.

Under 200, 75%; under 500, 16%; under 1000, 8%; 1000+, 1%.

Distribution by Associations

N. C. Assoc.	Other Assoc.	Non. Ac.
(1154)	(13)	(123)
(93)	(2)	(5)

PART II—THE COLLEGE POINT OF VIEW

If it should be the preponderant consensus of opinion of the principals of secondary schools that it would be greatly to the advantage of their schools to make changes in the plans of articulation of colleges and secondary schools in some of the ways suggested in Part I of this questionnaire, could you make such reorganization of the curricular plans of your college as to safeguard the value of your degrees and yet permit some of the changes, such as:

Yes. No. 1. Basing admission to classes in freshman English upon a qualifying test that would permit reasonable classification of the students upon the basis of their proficiency in English?

Col.	Tech.	T. C.	J. C.	Total
177*-94%	20-95%	16-88%	36-92%	249-93%
11	1	2	3	17

2. Granting a degree

Yes. No. (a) Without foreign languages?

80-48%	10-55%	12-70%	23-74%	125-54%
84	8	5	8	105

Yes. No. (b) Allowing the requirement in foreign languages to be a part of the college course?

147-88%	10-55%	15-94%	24-92%	196-85%
20	8	1	2	34

3. Granting a degree

*This reads: Of 249 deans, 94% in colleges and universities, 95% from technical schools, 88% from teachers' colleges, and 92% from junior colleges answered "yes."

Yes. No. (a) Without requiring college mathematics?

145-78%	7-32%	15-88%	29-91%	196-77%
40	15	2	3	58

Yes. No. (b) Offering a one-year college course in mathematics that would prepare the students for the present beginning course in college mathematics?

74-50%	1-6%	9-75%	21-73%	105-51%
72	15	3	8	98

Yes. No. 4. Organizing the beginning courses in college science so as not to require specific courses in the secondary school as a prerequisite?

168-87%	8-40%	18-100%	41-93%	235-86%
24	12	0	3	39

Yes. No. 5. Admitting students to college classes in the social sciences without assuming the knowledge of any specific courses in the secondary school in the social sciences?

167-85%	15-75%	14-78%	40-85%	236-84%
29	5	4	7	45

6. If you could assume maturity and a basis of the successful study of a well-balanced secondary school curriculum under intelligent guidance, would you be willing to base your admission requirements upon the recommendation of the Principal, without regard to

Yes. No. (a) Graduation from the secondary school?

97-50%	12-60%	7-47%	30-71%	146-54%
93	8	8	12	121

Yes. No. (b) The number of units completed in the secondary school?

74-42%	12-60%	6-38%	27-70%	119-47%
102	8	10	12	132

7. Upon the recommendation of the Principal, would you be willing to admit a student upon the basis of a

Yes. No. (a) Standardized comprehensive examination administered by your institution?

143-79%	18-95%	16-94%	29-80%	206-81%
38	1	1	6	46

Yes. No. (b) Psychological test, administered by your institution?

74-42%	5-33%	10-83%	23-61%	112-47%
101	10	2	15	128

Yes. No. (c) Standardized cumulative record from the school last attended, to be interpreted by your officials?

125-76%	16-84%	13-72%	32-84%	186-77%
40	3	5	6	54

8. Suggest some combination of the above plans or some other plan by which you would admit a student, exclusive of specific academic examinations.

Yes. No. 9. Do you feel that the graduation standards of your college have already been lowered by the changes you have thus far made in your plans for admission, these changes having been necessitated by reason of pressure brought to bear by the secondary school authorities?

16-10%	0-0%	2-11%	4-11%	22-10%
149	16	16	31	212

FLOOR DISCUSSIONS ON DR. ROSENLOF'S REPORT¹

Professor J. D. Eliff, University of Missouri: A number of states, among them my own, have been making studies on the articulation of secondary schools and colleges and I should like to ask permission to have Mr. Sanford, of the State Department of Education of Missouri, tell you what has been accomplished in Missouri.

Mr. J. G. Sanford, State Department of Education, Missouri: Very briefly, the State Department of Education, in connection with a group of men from the University of Missouri, spent about a year working on this proposition. After discussing and arguing and studying the situation from all angles, I think the main thing you would be interested in is the group of conclusions which we reached. I am glad to say that they quite closely parallel the report just given.

The final conclusion of that group was to the effect that the required courses now laid down by the State Department of Education for graduation from a four-year high school were to consist of three units in English, three in Social Science, one in Physical or Biological Science, one in Mathematics and one in Physical Education. The university accepted that recommendation that the remaining courses or units offered for graduation may be chosen from either subjects requiring the preparation or those not requiring preparation, and when any student applies for admission to the university who has completed the requirements laid down by the State Department for graduation, including the re-

quired courses just named, that student shall be entered without any question whatever. We have found, as a result of that, that it has very materially benefited the smaller schools where the question had been bothering them for a number of years as to how to meet some of the specific requirements for entrance to the university, as well as some of the liberal arts colleges where they were requiring courses in Foreign Languages.

At the present time I am glad to say that Missouri has eliminated the Foreign Language requirement and that now there is the closest cooperation between the university, the liberal arts college and the State Department of Education, and we have one and only one list of entrance requirements.

Chairman Reed: Is there someone else?

Mr. Ira M. Smith, University of Michigan: I noticed that the gentleman from Missouri named nine units as required by the State Department. Am I right? (Agreed) I think if you study the requirements of a considerable number of institutions you will find perhaps that they do not even prescribe nine units. I do not believe we are very far apart when we get right down to brass tacks and check up the requirements of specific colleges. We prescribe only eight units for admission to liberal arts at the University of Michigan. That, of course, is one unit less than this other. It is true that four additional units must come from the academic field, but they are not prescribed units in any particular subject. I feel that we are not so far apart and, in fact, I am not so sure but that the colleges have gone farther than the State Departments.

¹At the close of the report made by Dr. Rosenlof, Chairman Reed called for floor discussions on the theme of the evening. These discussions, as taken in Stenotype form, are presented here.—THE EDITOR.

Mr. J. G. Sanford: May I make one further statement that I omitted? That is the fact that of the sixteen units offered, eleven of them must come from the academic field.

Chairman Reed: Are there other comments or questions?

Member: May I ask Mr. Smith if it isn't true that he has two specified units, however, in addition. Then when you require two years in one subject the nine becomes twelve.

Mr. Ira M. Smith: I believe eight are specified.

Mr. Fred L. Kerr, University of Arkansas: I think we are going even farther than that. We are going to specify only six units, three being English, two Mathematics and one History, for admission to the college of arts and sciences. Five additional units must be academic and not more than four may be vocational, and fifteen required for admission to the university.

Chairman Reed: Are there any other questions or comments?

Mr. Otto F. Dubach, Kansas City Central High School: Representing a school in the so-called center of the United States and sending pupils from Minnesota on the north to Georgie Tech on the south, and from Harvard on the east to the various California colleges, I feel that we haven't hit the problem that concerns the fairly hard-worked principal. It isn't a question of numbers that are specified but the fact that in each institution there is something that some other institution does not require, and that we never dare say to our public, to our pupils, "Yes, you are prepared to enter college." I could even point out certain discrepancies in the various schools if it were worth while and if I dared consume the time of this audience. I am confident that the thing that bothers the men from the high schools, the larger high schools at least (those that send

their pupils all over the United States) is the fact that they never know when they have prepared a pupil for a particular school. Unfortunately a pupil does his choosing after he takes his subjects and not before.

Chairman Reed: And the problem is, with so many different subjects, what bearing have these subjects on the specific college course? I think that no high school man would object to specific requirements if he felt that they functioned in the beginning work of the student, but when the same class in the college contains students with preparations different from those specified, the question arises: Why have the specific requirements?

Mr. Dorcas, University of Iowa: I have said two or three times in the last two or three years that we no longer have any college entrance requirements so far as the college of liberal arts is concerned, and have not had requirements for admission to the college of liberal arts pretty generally throughout the country for the last twenty-five years. The reason that is largely true is that in a great many of the colleges of arts and sciences there is scarcely a single subject of study represented in the very complex high school curricula in which a college student may not get his very first courses in college and for college credit. That is true of Greek, of Latin, of French, of Spanish, of any foreign language. It is true of history of Europe, it is true of United States history, of government, of economics, of sociology. It is true of every single physical science; it is true of every single biological science. It is true of bookkeeping, commercial law, commercial geography, drawing, almost any subject within the so-called vocational realm. I think that is even true to a very considerable extent of English composition and rhetoric, and of American literature. People

can get college courses in English grammar and do nothing in the college of liberal arts. There are only three subjects of which that thing is not true today, and it has not been true pretty generally throughout the country for many years. Those subjects are arithmetic, algebra and plane geometry. I wait for a moment to ask for any other subject in the high school curricula of which the thing I am saying is not true. I think that largely ought to be true. It is no calumny, it is no accident that brought this situation about.

It is a fine thing that a boy throughout the whole long period of his secondary school education, which is the period of discovery for himself and the period of gradual adaptation of his final matured self to those subjects which represent human attainment, human effort and human interest, should see how he is going to yoke himself up with those subjects. He ought to have the opportunity, and I think he has had the opportunity for lo, these many years, to begin the subject of chemistry if not as a freshman in the high school then possibly as a sophomore or a junior or a senior, or, if not that soon, he should have the opportunity and does have the opportunity to get his very first introduction to the subject of chemistry in the senior year of his college course. That is the case also with every other subject that I have mentioned, and it ought to be. The time is coming when that will probably be the case with algebra and plane geometry.

Twenty years ago it was unthinkable for any college of liberal arts to give a course in which the boys and girls learned how to conjugate the Latin verbs and to parse the Latin nouns, but within a very few years the colleges all over the country were giving courses for college credit in beginning Latin and in Caesar.

Cannot the professors of mathematics

make the subjects of beginning algebra and plane geometry a fair challenge to good students after those adolescents have reached the age of seventeen or eighteen or nineteen years? I know they can make it appear a worthy college subject. Those boys and girls don't have to take a year to get through in elementary algebra, but it can be made a fair challenge to them.

By reason of this situation and by reason of a conception which I think most of us have with reference to the whole period of secondary education, namely, that it is a period of discovery (and sometimes it takes a boy a long while to discover what his ultimate capacities are), why should we be too much concerned over contemplating a boy or girl at the age of seventeen or eighteen years who has completed a high-school course of study four years in length, which has been made up of sixteen different units and perhaps in sixteen different subjects, provided only that he is recognized at the end of that four-year period by the high school administration as a youngster of a good mind, who has reached that level of intellectual maturity which we can all expect a boy or girl of that age to reach if he is just healthy and normal and who has exhibited through the high school course a real interest in these subjects? And when that high-school administration is ready to say, "This boy or girl wants to go to college," or "This boy wants to continue the effort to find himself and we believe that he can," I think we should take him. Not only that, I think we all want him. We all want to do the best we can with him.

The principle of concentration I recognize as valid but he has four more years in which to make use of that principle, and probably he would have a better opportunity to find the right field of concentration if he has had a taste of more

different kinds of things in his preceding four-year period.

Dr. A. C. Nelson, University of Denver: Mr. Dorcas has hit upon exactly what I have been turning over in my mind tonight and for sometime before. With respect to our college entrance requirements, I think we have been too interested in standardizing them for the convenience of the people prescribing the high school curricula or for Registrars admitting students to college.

I can't get away from the remark which was made some two years ago by a member of our association, the Registrars' Association, when he said that one very important principle of education, which may have been lost sight of, was that those individuals who are trained in particular professions or particular branches of knowledge in which a student was going to carry on his study and become trained should be the ones who should determine what is required to become an expert or a trained individual in that particular branch of knowledge. That has always appealed to me. I am rather surprised that 32 per cent, for example, of technical high school deans should feel that they would be willing to graduate a student and grant him an engineering degree (I presume that is involved in that case) without any college mathematics. I have been scientifically trained myself and I recognize the importance of a good foundation in mathematics for many of the sciences, particularly those sciences which have to do with engineering. That is going over into the biological science and other sciences very rapidly. So I should say that those engineering people ought to be the ones to determine what the prerequisites for that particular field should be.

I know of a number of cases. A student has come in and wanted to take a Ph.D. degree. It was discovered that the experts in that field believed that he

should have a reading knowledge of French and German in order to qualify from that angle. There never seemed to be any particular blame on the graduate school for what the college has not taught or not advised the students to take. So it seems to me that we might just as well stop kidding ourselves on these things. Almost all colleges say that they prescribe certain units. Then we say a student presenting some units but not according to this particular pattern may be admitted. I wonder what would happen if we should become bold enough to say, "We will discard that traditional idea and attempt to build upon what the student comes with when he arrives at the college. If he has had two years of foreign languages and wants to go on with it, let him start at that point and go on. If he hasn't had any and wants to begin, let him come on."

We could require a high school education in whatever subjects he might have been able to get, whatever subjects he may be advised to take. Possibly we should take him with what he has and build upon that instead of saying he must have so much of this and so much of that.

The University of Denver in a small way has been attempting to do something similar to that. We are planning our junior college requirements in the college of liberal arts on the basis of the training the student has had in his two years in college and upon what the faculty of that institution feels he should have in the various fields before we pass him on to the senior college. On that basis we have arbitrarily said, to be sure, that if the student has had four years of high-school foreign languages we will not require him to take any more in college unless he wishes to do so. If he has had none in high school and we think he ought to know something about foreign languages, we will require him

to take in college a certain amount, which is approximately equivalent to that which the other students may have had in high school. The same thing can be said for sciences; the same thing can be said for the social sciences.

As Dr. Dorcas has said, the students can gain the beginning instruction in any one of the fields in the college and it isn't necessary for those coming with the preparatory work in those particular subjects to go on. I don't know whether a case will arise, but it is conceivable that a student might come with sixteen units made up of shop and laboratory, manual training, arts, music, and what not, and then start in, to meet our requirements, with a full curriculum made up of so much social sciences, so much foreign language, so much mathematics, so much natural or biological science, and so on through the list when preparing for the junior college year. The excuse for that would be that the student had changed his mind and wanted to do something different from that which he had started out to do.

I think we might well think in terms of that general direction rather than making an exception which we don't all make anyway.

Mr. J. G. Masters, Central High School, Omaha: I think Mr. Dorcas has presented an ideal situation rather than a practical one. I don't want to quarrel with him. Seven per cent of our youngsters go to college in the West and the extreme West. When we make inquiry of almost any college where our youngsters go we learn that they have definite requirements. If the youngsters don't have these they have to make them up in college. I have no quarrel with that but I say in a practical way you college people are requiring pretty definite content after all from the high school youths. If the youngster has to make it up after he goes to college, what is the difference.

He can do it probably better than in high school.

I think that the colleges and universities have done an enormous amount of good with some of their requirements. Otherwise we would probably have these youngsters going along in a nebulous way. I know a good many of you will not accept that position. I have not found any great objection on the part of youngsters to doing, at least in two or three fields, a pretty definite content. A good student or a fair student is perfectly willing to take two or three years of work in some one or some two or three fields. Practically all of our work is elective in our Central High School in Omaha excepting English, and of course the youngsters know that they must meet certain definite requirements for certain colleges. Knowing that they must do that work they are prepared. I am not convinced at all, men and women, that some of these so-called newer courses do have the content, the progressive coherence, the progressive quality, nor am I convinced that their content is maintained as well as perhaps some of our sometimes called more rigid academic subjects. The colleges and universities after all have done a great thing for education in the American high school. I think the average American high school does have an enormous amount of latitude. The courses have grown up in response to community needs pretty largely. Every big high school now runs from Dan to Beersheba in the stuff it offers and I think we are all glad that it does, but those students who expect to go to college at all, I find, are perfectly willing to take a pretty definite content in a few fields, and I am inclined to think that as yet, until we are pretty certain about some of these other more nebulous fields, perhaps we are still doing a good thing by it.

Mr. B. C. B. Tighe, Fargo Senior High School, Fargo, North Dakota: I was in-

terested in what the speaker had to say but I am inclined to think some of us would heartily agree with him that we need to consider that those pupils who are going to college should have a definite group preparation along certain lines. It seems to me we have lost sight of the fact in this so-called standardization of college requirements that for some years now we have been thinking in terms of non-standardization from the standpoint of boys and girls, where we had been thinking of non-homogeneous groups.

It seems to me we have to consider, Mr. Chairman, a little bit what our philosophy of education is at the present time, whether after all any boy may not be entitled to an educational course, taking it up in the elementary school, the junior high school, the senior high school and the college, in so far as he is able to cope with certain lines of educational material which are presented to him. I can't see why there should be an insuperable barrier at the point that we ordinarily determine to be the twelfth and thirteenth grades, so to speak, or, in other words, between the high school and the college, except that that has become traditional and we have become somewhat traditionally minded in that. We no longer consider that there is any barrier between the junior and the senior high school, and if that is the case (and I think it is right that we should think so), should there be, from the standpoint of modern philosophy of education, any great barrier existing between the senior high school and the college? It seems to me the problem in the college is somewhat like this, not to shut out and not to put up a barrier there to the boy and girl who graduates from high school who has made an honest effort, who put forth a certain amount of energy. All of these pupils are coming up and within a certain time we draw out from them the best things that will in a measure make citi-

zens of them. It seems to me that we should continue that feeling, that within the college there should be very rightly, I think, the feeling to encourage the potential qualifications of the boys and girls when they get there, that the college shouldn't shut them out on any preconceived notion that is largely traditional. I think all courses of study should be so prescribed as to challenge the very best intelligence of every pupil in the school, and that we must, however, recognize that those abilities are very different. We all, I think, recognize that. Because we may say, "Here is a pupil with Ability C," while another pupil may have an Ability A, there is no reason, it seems to me, why the C pupil should not be permitted to go on and finish college any more than A, providing he is properly placed and there has been a proper amount of guidance in the senior high school and in college. In other words, our philosophy of education today is to make citizens, it seems to me, as it has always been, and that we shall give to these pupils such a college course, as well as a high school course, that will socialize them and develop that citizenship to the highest degree.

Mr. Dorcas: I want to make reply to one of Mr. Master's objections to what I had to say on the basis of my own belief, that the University of Iowa still has a very definite insuperable requirement for admission in both algebra and geometry, and yet I still say that even algebra and geometry are no recent requirements for admission, and they have not been since 1905 in our own institution. That is what I mean. In 1905 in our own institution we provided for giving the degree of B.S. with no need to include freshman Mathematics. It is on that account that even though we insist nobody is able to enter college as a candidate for graduation without having been certified, at least, as knowing one

unit of algebra and one unit of plane geometry, there is no need of that boy or girl ever showing whether he knows it or not. He can still get his Bachelor's degree and he can still be and often is a very fine type of student who has acquired a very worthy liberal education in the four years without Mathematics.

It is in that sense, Mr. Master, that I think there are many of our requirements on paper which are not essentially requirements for admission.

Mr. J. G. Master: I agree with you.

Chairman Reed: Is there anyone else?

Mr. Carl G. F. Franzen, Indiana University: Indiana University is trying an interesting experiment this fall, somewhat following the work Missouri is doing. We are opening up an elective college. Mr. Cavanaugh, our Extension Director, as some of you may know, got the inspiration from the University of Minnesota. That is why I should like someone from Minnesota to say something tonight. In this elective college we will admit students next fall who have admission certificates from the high schools in the state. The commissioned high school requirements for graduation are not quite as much as at Michigan, or the same amount as at Michigan but not so much as at Missouri. That is, three of English, two of Social Science, one of any Science and one of any Mathematics. We do not require Algebra and Geometry. It may be Arithmetic or it may be Shop Mathematics of any kind. There is one in Physical Education, which makes eight that the state requires for graduation in the commissioned high schools of Indiana. We at the University will admit to the elective college this fall any student who meets those requirements. When they come to the college they do not have to take any specified course excepting English and Military Training and Physical Education. At the end of their two years there they receive a

certificate. I should like to hear from anyone at Minnesota to what extent they are modernizing their entrance requirements along the lines we are doing at Indiana.

Chairman Reed: Can anyone answer Mr. Franzen on that point, anyone from Minnesota?

Mr. Carl G. F. Franzen: I should like to state that the School of Education, which I represent, also admits all graduates of commissioned high schools who meet the same entrance requirements that I have mentioned, as required by the school of liberal arts to give a degree.

Member: What do you mean by students in the elective college being admitted to courses such as you have mentioned? I know a little bit about Minnesota as I live across the line. They have set up special courses in the junior college and they are not the same courses you find in the ordinary liberal arts college. Those courses are devised especially for the junior college. Do you set up special courses for your elective college, or could a boy enter a course in History of Civilization which any other student in liberal arts could enter?

Mr. Franzen: No.

Member: Then what courses are they eligible to enter?

Mr. Franzen: Any course to which any professor admits them.

Member: On what basis do the professors admit them?

Mr. Franzen: Let me explain that. We want to follow the Minnesota plan so far as possible. This is a period of depression. I think some of you are aware of that. It is impossible with the present schedule and load of the instructors to offer the courses which Minnesota has offered. Those are specialized courses, a tie-over between the time they come in and go out. We are using this hybrid arrangement. It isn't entirely satisfactory but we don't know how it is going to

work. The reason we don't give the same courses as at Minnesota is the one I have mentioned. The teaching load is at the maximum and it would require additional teachers, and we can't consider adding teachers now. When the time comes we shall use such courses as Minnesota has, I am sure we will do that.

Member: May I ask another question? I am in touch with a good number of students who have gone to the Minnesota Junior College. I have never entered a classroom there and I have never talked to the dean except on the telephone, so I don't know very much about it. I have read a very elaborate pamphlet and I have written to men in the Twin Cities and have had several letters from many high school seniors. I have received over 200 letters from boys who have entered the junior college at the University of Minnesota. They said they had not been hoodwinked but they had been kidded into the belief they were attending a better junior college, and now some of the boys complain that they haven't gotten what they expected. That is not an indictment against the junior college. I think it serves its purpose. I should like to get some more information from the man from Indiana. The selection of the students for the junior college at the University of Minnesota is based upon tests. When the college ability rating falls below 35 (and that is determined by averaging the student's rank in his high school classes with the percentile ranking of the Minnesota college aptitude test), the statistics show that if you rank below 35 in your college ability rating you have only one chance in 50 of graduating from the university. Therefore it is felt than anyone who ranks below 35 would be better off if he went into a special type of school, which hopes to do some of these things in character building, citizenship training, and some of these other intangibles which we have

no way of measuring. They are not sent to the junior college because they lack high school credits. You may have four years of Foreign Languages, three of Mathematics, three of Laboratory Science, a few of all the subjects required to enter Harvard, except that you have to have a graduate in the district to recommend you. They have the subjects required to enter Harvard but if you have a college ability rating of ten or below thirty-five you are advised to enter the junior college.

Your elective college at Indiana University, as I understand it, is recommended for those students who are deficient in the required courses. Is that right?

Mr. Franzen: I suppose that is what it amounts to, yes. It is an attempt to do what they are doing in Missouri, that is, to try to bring together the state requirements for graduation and entrance requirements to the university.

In that connection, I should like to know how many states have state requirements for graduation. What are the requirements used as a standard for the commissioned high schools? I think that is the place to begin. In the university we work with the secondary schools as organized by the state department because we represent the state university. I am particularly interested in it from that angle. You see, if we did that these Foreign Languages and Algebra and Geometry and so on would not necessarily be considered.

Mr. Johnson, University of Michigan: There is an accustomed reaction of high school principals to the college requirements. I think it is a fact that the high school principal is considering the larger proportion, in many cases, who are not going to college. Most of this discussion bears upon those who are going to college. I think there is a de facto setting of the requirements that some recognize.

This is not only for the smaller high schools where they have state requirements but it is also true of the larger high schools in this way. John Jones' father is sure that the boy must take certain courses. He must take Latin or French or at least some language. He must take trigonometry or geometry because those are the requirements specifically for entrance to the university, if he goes to the university. John Jones will find out before he graduates that these aren't along the lines of his aptitude. In the meantime the high school has very definitely failed to contribute to his growth appropriately and it has done so largely because it has been handicapped by the rigidity of the requirements.

I don't believe that there would be much change in the provisions of the average high school for those who are going to college were college entrance requirements made advisory on the part of the college and university.

Two years ago Mr. Carrothers of Michigan made a study as to what high school principals would do if they didn't have to do what the colleges required. The result showed very little difference in what would be required. There weren't very many changes that were suggested in the requirements. I think that the advisory suggestions of the uni-

versity would have pretty generally the same effect for those who do go to college. It would free the high school principal in advising the larger proportion of the students in many institutions who aren't going to college. He could say, "If you do satisfactory work in the subject that seems from your previous work to be best for you, you can enter college on that basis." In discussing the aptitude test, the high school principals favored that over the comprehensive examination, whereas the deans were of the opinion that the test of ability to do college work, and the quality of work in the high school, makes a basis of college admission which frees the high school principal to intelligently guide and advise high school pupils.

Chairman Reed: Is there anyone else? Let me call your attention to a pamphlet I have in my hand here, written by the Registrar of Michigan, I. M. Smith, the Report of the Committee on Personal Data Records. If you are interested in it Mr. Master will pass them out to any part of the room.

On behalf, then, of the two organizations here assembled, the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, I desire to thank you for your presence and participation in this conference. I bid you good-night.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF OBJECTIVES IN THE REORGANIZATION OF SECONDARY EDUCATION¹

J. E. FOSTER
Iowa State College

WHY talk about educational objectives? Does not everyone know all that is to be said on the subject?

We drove from Jerusalem to Bethlehem. As we passed by the fields where the shepherds watched by night and as we went on to the Church of the Nativity you may imagine that we fell into an attitude of reverent contemplation. The Church of the Nativity is a rambling building. We passed through corridors, up and down steps and around corners until we finally arrived at the spot where the Savior was born; but all thoughts of a religious and historical nature were dissipated by what we saw there. Here was a fully accoutered soldier in uniform, fully armed, ready to shoot. He had a rifle, a revolver and a cartridge belt, apparently filled. This sight was not only surprising but horrible. The reason for the situation is that one Christmas morning many years ago a fight occurred here. Each of five sects of Christianity has vested interests in certain areas around this holy place and each of the five guards its prerequisites very jealously. On the Christmas morning in question the priests of two sects fell into controversy at the birthplace of the Prince of Peace and tragic deaths resulted on the spot. This happened notwithstanding the repeated iteration of the Ten Commandments and the Sermon on the Mount and the principles enunciated by the Master during his life on earth.

Educational objectives have been adopted, have been reiterated and yet

there is comparatively little application of them. This Association a number of years ago adopted officially the objectives submitted by the Commission on Unit Courses and Curricula. Educational objectives must be emphasized again and again for the same reason that the principles of the Christian religion must be emphasized over and over. Nobody puts either into practice to any extent.

It is not hard to find reasons for the non-application of educational objectives. For one thing many schools and colleges of education leave out of their curricula reference to the great aims of education. Measurements of various kinds are emphasized. Statistics, tables and the like look very scientific and very scholarly. Objectivity is a watchword with some. Tests concerned mainly with factual material are featured. Or in some cases financial lay-outs, budgets and building programs are the main considerations. The present deplorable conditions in the United States are a striking proof of the unessential character in and of themselves of the kinds of emphasis just mentioned. There is little possibility of the spectacular in the consideration of objectives. There is no superficial thrill. The objectives have to do largely with the intangibles of living and these intangibles from their very nature do not lend themselves to notoriety.

It is often argued that these objectives are useless because no school can attain them; few teachers can be found who can apply them or even understand them. Every noteworthy set of ideals has suffered in the same way. It may as well

¹An address delivered before the North Central Association, April 21, 1933.—THE EDITOR.

be realized first as last that these objectives do not stop short of the reorganization of society, the eventual perfecting of the human race. Is this a fantastic dream, an impossible goal? On the other hand, who can measure the capabilities of man? The objectives are far-off, divine aims of civilization towards which the whole of secondary education should move.

Application of objectives fails too often because superintendents and high school principals are engrossed in petty details of the moment to the exclusion of consideration of supreme results. Again, because of educational practice the teacher is intent upon the mastery of a subject on the part of his pupils as his principal business. How futile and unreasonable such an ultimate objective is appears at once when we consider how the factual material of some of these subjects changes. Who would teach now the universally accepted facts of physics as they were given in 1915? Science, we are told, really began in 1917. The atom "ain't what it used to be"; maybe it will change again. On the other hand the wants and needs and troubles of the human race are essentially what they were in Abraham's time and Socrates time. There are abiding elements in living; wants and needs that are repeated in each succeeding generation; problems that arise every time a child is born. Says Christian Gauss: "Socrates could probably not have passed high school algebra, had never heard of a negative quantity or mathematical infinity and probably believed like all our ancestors until 1850 that heat was a substance. Yet he apprehended the truths of a great art and a great philosophy, lived wisely and well in his world and was done to death by an intolerant demos . . ."

The apparently detailed analysis of the pattern of objectives has operated to confuse and discourage teachers and ad-

ministrators. The North Central book attempts to overcome this difficulty. Without the understanding and the co-operation of the teacher the objectives cannot possibly be attained through the curriculum. He must have eternally in mind the reason for teaching the unit in hand not primarily as an undertaking to be achieved in terms of correct answers to an examination but as an undertaking to be achieved in terms of actual living both during school years and after. The teacher must catch a vista of the years ahead for each child. He must impart a vision to these boys and girls for without vision the people perish.

The objectives have been determined by an analysis of the universal needs of men not only in the present but throughout the past as far as can be determined. They are also based on future needs so far as these can be anticipated. No one can be said to be living successfully unless he is an effective contributor to the happiness and well-being of a home; unless he is a good neighbor; unless he has an intelligent and sympathetic attitude toward his fellow countrymen and the other two billion humans in the world; unless he is earning a living; unless he is spending his working and leisure hours in right ways. The past, the present and visions of the future must be drawn upon in revising, reforming, re-interpreting these objectives.

This clearly points to the necessity of regarding the objectives as incomplete—as in process of development. It is entirely possible that the objectives of this Association should be considered in the light of possible additions or new interpretations. It seems that at least two additional objectives should be considered in this connection, one pertaining to esthetics and the other to religion—religion possibly as the super or master objective which will unify and integrate the great interests of life.

The American people are strong supporters of the American high school. In no other country are there so many boys and girls per thousand of population in attendance in high schools; in no other country are there such enormous expenditures for secondary education; and yet the man who pays the taxes and the parent who has children in school have not so far, in general, decided what the high school is for. We don't know where we're going, or even in some cases where we want to go, but we have been on our way spending multiplied tens of millions of dollars on equipment, teachers and buildings. Is it not high time to decide what we actually wish to accomplish in secondary education?

In this period of depression of all times it seems essential that there should be an understanding of the aims of education. What are the criteria by which a subject is elected or rejected by the school boards of Oskaloosa and Oshkosh, Chickasha and Chillicothe, Laramie and Livermore? For example, why is home economics eliminated? In many cases because some school board member says, "These girls can learn to cook at home." Why is plane geometry retained in many schools while agriculture is dropped? *You* answer, please. Why are certain athletic, musical, declamatory and academic contests retained and maintained at comparatively high expense? So as to keep the town on the map or because influential parents like to see their children in the limelight. In deciding upon the retention or rejection of a subject there is little or no reference to any carefully defined aims of the high school relating to the essentials of living.

The schools have not made a good showing when measured by the criteria of successful living. How many graduates of high schools or of colleges can you name at this moment who in your judgment are living successful lives? What

did the high school or college do to help them in their living? I know a young man whose case is typical—a college graduate, who is completely bowled over because he has lost his job. Neither high school nor college helped him to acquire interests, points of view, and fortitude to withstand temporal reverses. He has no philosophy of living.

Just now there is a disposition to center all school values in social science. While social understanding is very important I believe this will prove insufficient. The distressing examples of the exploitation of great numbers of people and of the betrayal of public trust by Insull, Krueger, Mitchell, Capone, Fall, Sinclair, and others have served to emphasize the need of developing in our students the disposition and ability to sustain social relationships that will have regard for the welfare of the many. Big Business has never had a vision of the welfare of the ordinary folks involved in its enterprises. Dividends, profits and incomes have been the primary measure of success. Almost literally Big Business has said "To Hell with the children; we want profits." The spectacle of Chicago today in its treatment of public school teachers as compared with its treatment of political appointees is an illustration in point. It would be more creditable to the leaders in this city to spend a little less on its World's Fair and more on its children. The former, however, is supposed to bring profits. The attitude, through the years, of business in general toward child labor, working hours, wages, old age pensions and other matters of social welfare indicates that nothing can be expected from that quarter in the maintenance of public schools. And yet there is no great point in denouncing Big Business with the thought that laws restricting it will rectify the fundamental educational defects of the time. Besides, Big Business can always hire attorneys

of the greatest ability to work against the public interest. Moreover the rest of us would accumulate wealth in the same fashion as the master minds if we were smart enough to do so. Millions will flow into the stock market any time the gambling is promising. The rank and file of us are anxious, as Lincoln Steffens shows in his autobiography, to participate in the illegitimate profits from a bad city, state and national government.

Passionate outbursts of protest against the methods of Big Business will not contribute much to the development of a great system of education for the United States. Educationists must go deeper than mere criticism of our once shining bankers, brokers, captains of industry and "greatest Secretaries of the Treasury since Alexander Hamilton" if abiding values are to be secured. We teachers must do our best to develop attitudes, interests and ideals to accord with the great objectives of civilization that we know are desirable.

The objectives, as the word "ultimate" indicates, are long-time goals—long time in two senses, first, that generations of human beings must come and go before their perfect attainment, and second, long time as to the children involved. In a controlled environment between the ages of 12 to 18 is it reasonable to try to do something to these young souls that will affect them still at the age of 30 or 40 or 70 or 80? In some quarters it is maintained that the schools should disregard the future, that the future will take care of itself if we arrange for a series of experiences that will get the youngster along from day to day. It would surely be a queer sort of procedure in any great undertaking that would confine itself solely to the details of today with no thought of planning for results 10, 20, 50 years ahead. Intelligent foresight and planning for the future has always been and will continue

to be a wise method of procedure in living.

I have observed scores of high school recitations. In many of these there was no hint of any connection between the subject taught and the art of living. Pupils too often live in one world in school and in a totally unrelated world when they leave school. For example, economists in general have taught that high tariffs are inimical to public interest while their students have gone out and uniformly voted for high tariffs. Even with some of our great statesmen and jurists honesty and integrity mean one thing in private life; quite another in business and professional life. Many teachers proceed with their subjects as though these subjects had not the faintest relation to being alive. In contrast I think of two great teachers whose classes I attended. I have in mind W. G. Sumner and William Lyon Phelps. One could not sit through a single recitation conducted by either of these master teachers and not become increasingly conscious of himself as related to other human beings and to the universe. The act of living on the part of human beings was the thought always uppermost.

The question inevitably arises: Can we attain the objectives by means of the traditional subject unit? In the last chapter of the North Central book Dean Stout has written (pp. 385-86) that,

... It was assumed that curricular improvement could be secured by changes in the subject matter of subject units already existing, and nothing beyond that was contemplated, except possibly that the organization of field units would be undertaken. The functional unit represents a radical departure from this procedure and if this type of organization of subject matter is actually secured, it gives promise at least of close correspondence between what the original committee set out to do and its accomplishment.

... Except for a small number of field units which do not seem to be much improvement over the units displaced by them, educational practice is universally carried on by the use of subject units. . . . Those who attempt fruitful

revision in subject matter are dealing not only with traditional concepts of organization but also with traditional philosophies of education which underlie them; and it is with these philosophies that we are concerned quite as much as with the units themselves.

Disregarding high school subjects (e.g. English, Latin) as such, is it possible to select and organize instructional material and school activities so that in the actual living of the pupils a given ultimate objective or a certain phase of it may be attained? If so, let us term such an arrangement and application of stimuli a functional unit. With this interpretation it is at once apparent that these units must center in the ultimate objectives or their subdivisions. Functional units may be formulated within some such categories as the following: the right use of leisure time, worthy home membership, physical health, mental health, public sanitation, sustaining right international relationships, good citizenship, the selection of a vocation, effectiveness in some selected vocation.

A committee of this Commission today presented a functional unit.

Here and there are encouraging evidences of functional teaching. For example, teachers are inspiring their students to be socially minded. A few weeks ago the Iowa legislature was considering a bill whose effects would be exceedingly detrimental to many school districts and municipalities in the state. Students of the Burlington High School on their own initiative, as I hear the story, got up a petition of protest against the measure and sent representatives to the state legislature with it. These same students then appealed to students of other high schools of the state to make similar protests. Roosevelt High in Des Moines, Cherokee High and many others responded. The committee on Survey and

Publication of Trends of Curriculum Revision has collected some notable examples. A portion of the National Survey of Secondary Schools describes cases of this kind. The new book of the Association, "High School Curriculum Reorganization," gives actual examples of the attempts of individual teachers to disregard high school subjects, as such, in their thinking and in their classroom practice and to fix their eyes steadfastly on curricular material and school procedure that will help the student to live in modern society.

Human experience has shown many of the desirable aspects of civilization. What a boon to an individual if the secondary school can help him go through life successfully as regards religion, health, use of leisure time, esthetic enjoyment, his vocation, his family life, his relations with other people in the community and with peoples of other countries.

In a message in the May 1933 issue of *Scribner's*, the scientist-philosopher Michael Pupin declares:

The powers discovered and harnessed by the scientist and the engineer have no control over the spiritual world. These powers cannot banish the demons of materialism from the habitation which the soul of man has reserved for her favorite offspring, beauty and goodness. The spiritual powers of the human heart are the only powers which are destined to banish them and to exterminate selfishness and greed, hatred and fear, from the soul of man. But who can arouse these dormant powers of the human heart and develop their irresistible force? Not the scientists and engineers, the leaders of the physical world. We must have similar leaders in the spiritual world. It is the highest mission of our civilization to find and to train such leaders and to aid them in their gigantic task of delivering the soul of man from the demons of materialism. The family and the school, the college and the university, and above all, the church are called upon to carry the burdens of this sacred mission.

SOCIAL TRENDS AND TRENDS IN EDUCATION¹

CHARLES HUBBARD JUDD
The University of Chicago

MY PURPOSE in choosing the subject which I have taken for the talk this afternoon is not to attempt, in any sense of the word, a complete summary of the findings with regard to social trends, nor is it my purpose to attempt in any wise to offer you any complete summary of the trends in education. But I have thought it might be stimulating to comment on some of the interrelations between the changes that are going on in American society and the changes which are going on in American education.

Too frequently the schools and colleges of this country have, I think, been regarded as apart from and separate from the other activities of the nation. We have found ourselves, for example, through the decisions of the courts, very frequently regarded not as part of the local government in any given community. Many laymen are utterly unaware of the changes that have been going on in the schools, and, certainly, many people are unaware of the motives that have prompted these changes.

If we can, in some fashion, bring together our consideration of social changes and educational changes, and if we can bring to the attention of the laymen who today are in many instances very critical of education, the fact that the changes which have been going on in the schools have been worked out by the educational group because of changes that have been taking place in society, I think we can establish a more cordial relationship between the schools and local governments, and between schools and the opin-

ion of those who have to support public institutions through taxation.

I purpose, therefore, commenting on four lines of relationship between social trends and educational trends. I call attention, first of all, to the fact that one of the major changes in American life has been a change in the distribution of the population of the United States. That change can be described in two groups of terms. In the first place, there has been a distinct modification within our national history of the proportion of children and adults. So marked is that change that if you go back to the beginning of our national life and consider the facts which were ascertained in the first census that was taken in the United States, a census that was taken in 1790, you find that at that time for every one thousand children of sixteen years of age or under, there were only seven hundred and eighty-two adults of twenty years of age and over. In other words, the children were distinctly in the majority.

The seven hundred and eighty-two adults, of course, were depended upon in those days for the maintenance of our national life. The children, on the other hand, were, in some measure, dependent members of society. If we neglect for the moment the changes that gradually took place during the first century and a half, practically, of our national life and come to the census of 1930, we find a very astonishing change. It is a change that has been taking place gradually during all of the decades, but in 1930, for every thousand children of sixteen years of age and under, there were 2,013

¹An address delivered at the time of the annual meeting in Chicago, April 22, 1933.—THE EDITOR.

adults. In other words, there are twice as many adults today as there are children. Indeed, the facts grow very impressive when you consider the change that has taken place during the last decade, between the census of 1920 and 1930.

Although the population of the United States had increased by 17,000,000, there were 128,000 less children of five years of age and under in the United States in 1930 than there were in 1920. Our population has changed its character. If you consider the implications of that change, you will instantly recognize the fact that in industry there is a totally different basis of support for the nation in the fact that the adults are in the great majority, and in the families of our nation there is a totally different distribution of the family population. The fact of the case is that, instead of the large families that were found in 1790, when our first national census was taken, the statistical statement with regard to families at the present time is that the statistical average of families in the United States at the present moment shows that there are 3.6 persons constituting the typical family at the present time.

This change in distribution of our population with regard to children, on the one hand, and adults on the other is paralleled by another change of distribution of our population. This time we need not go back so far as I went back a moment ago in order to show the relation between child population and adult population.

Suppose we go back to the beginning of the period when our nation began to be a machine nation in its industry. If you go back to 1880 you find that approximately three-quarters of the population of the United States lived at that time in rural areas and derived its support from agriculture and family, domestic manufacturing. At the present

moment fifty-six per cent of the population of the United States is to be found in cities. What are cities? Cities have been created by industry. They are the centers where power is available for manufacturing purposes, and when power is to be used as a major contributor to the economic life of a nation, people must be brought together in these centers of population.

We have, therefore, not only a change in the balance between children and adults, but we have a complete change in the balance between our rural populations and our urban populations. Again, this is a fact which is of vital concern to industry but it is also a fact which is of vital concern to the organization of education, because education in our great cities has come to be an essential part of our social life. It is quite impossible to think of children growing up in these congested centers of population if they are not supplied by the same society that brought cities into existence—I say if these children are not supplied with the conditions of a wholesome life and a possible development, it is quite impossible to think of the children in our cities as growing up solely in their homes. The fact is that industry has, in very many cases, taken the mother as well as the father out of the home during the day, and it is quite impossible to think of these young children as growing up in such open spaces as are naturally provided in our cities. Children cannot be found on the streets. They do not have adequate park space, even in our most progressive cities. If it were not for the schools, there would be no place in which these children could secure a wholesome surrounding for their natural developments.

In other words, the changes that have taken place have made it necessary for society to furnish a substitute for the open spaces of the rural areas in which

children earlier grew up, and it has become necessary in our schools to provide a training for a more complex civilization, for, in these early days, large families contributed to the support of the families and they learned the industrial lessons of life in the home and on the farm. Today our children grow up in the cities where it is quite impossible to furnish them with that direct type of education which was so common in earlier times.

I turn to a second set of considerations, and this set of considerations, I think, can be described to you as of somewhat more immediate significance to our educational thought. We are today confronted by a school population which is the direct complement of all of those changes that have been going on in industry. In order to make that perfectly clear, I shall need to review some of the facts with regard to the use of children in industry, and I am going to take a very striking illustration. I am going to take the illustration that comes from the upper levels of the elementary schools.

If you consider children from ten to fifteen years of age, you readily recognize that is a period when children should have been in the elementary schools completing the work of a most rudimentary and general type.

If you go back to the same period to which I referred a few moments ago when we were an agrarian people, when the modern machine industry was just beginning to appear as the characteristic type of industry in this nation, if you go back specifically to 1870 you will find that the census returns of that date show that of the children ten to fifteen years of age, thirteen per cent were employed in gainful occupations. That does not include the children who were at work on farms or children at work in the home. Thirteen per cent were in gainful occupation. And as machinery begins to de-

velop, and it did develop very rapidly between 1870 and 1880, you find that the employment of children increases. The percentage of employment goes from thirteen to sixteen, and I am omitting fractions. That means that the machinery that was being developed at that time made it possible to utilize little children—not a matter to boast of, by the way, for very commonly these children were exploited for their small wages. But, nevertheless, industry could use the children and did use the children in an increasing degree.

When you come to 1890, that sixteen per cent increases to eighteen per cent, showing again that society finds it possible in some measure to take care of its young children in the factories and in other forms of occupation.

Now society apparently begins to hesitate in this progressive development of employment of little children, and in the two decades following 1890, you find that that percentage holds. There is a slight fractional increase above eighteen per cent. But in 1890 and 1900 and 1910, eighteen per cent represents the employment of children from ten to fifteen years of age in gainful occupations.

Between 1910 and 1920 a very radical change takes place and in a direction opposite to that which is exhibited by the figures that I have just presented. The change was so radical that the takers of the census felt obligated to offer some kind of a paragraph, almost of apology. They said that perhaps the figures had been collected at the wrong time in the year. They were astonished at the drop that had taken place in the employment of little children, because that eighteen per cent that was characteristic of the decades just before 1910 drops, in the census of 1920, to less than nine per cent, and when the census in 1930 is taken it becomes perfectly obvious that

a new trend has appeared, and there is no necessity, in the census of 1930, of any apology for the falling off in the census returns. The fact is today, of the children who for a long period have been employed to the extent exhibited in the figures I gave you earlier, this percentage has now dropped off to 4.7 per cent in the census of 1930.

Children are being excluded from industry. It is true not only of these little children to whom I have referred, but if you canvass the figures for the older ages you find exactly the same sort of fact. You come back to that earlier figure which I gave you. The competition among adults in the educational scheme has come to be so sharp and keen that society does not need its children, and society is not utilizing its children, and society is not protecting its children in factories. It is not taking care of them in the fashion which it did, in a very large measure, in earlier years. Where are these children? The answer, of course, is perfectly clear if you study the statistics that are the complements of the statistics that we have been discussing, for you find the registrations in the schools corresponding directly to the falling off that has taken place in the employment of children. I mention just two figures. I dare say some of these figures are perfectly familiar to you.

We have the exact figures of the increase in the eighth grade between 1918 and 1928, and during that decade the registration in the eighth grades of American schools increased thirty-nine per cent. Nothing of that sort has ever happened in any civilization before. The explanation is to be found directly in the facts which I mentioned earlier.

The other significant facts are with regard to registration in secondary and higher schools, and those facts, I dare say, are well known to you. If you take the figures for the beginning of this

century you will find that in 1900 we had one-half million young people in the secondary schools of the United States, and in 1930 we had four and one-half million. Or, if you take the figures for higher educational institutions you find that at the beginning of the century there were some 200,000 students in these institutions and today there are 1,200,000.

Here, again, you have had a tremendous expansion of the schools, dictated not by the desire of the schools for a larger population. You have a change in the character of the school population, complementing and corresponding, in that sense, directly to the change that has taken place in society outside of the schools.

It seems to me that if we could get clearly before the laymen of this country the fact that the American school serves society in a fashion that is dictated by society, we might, in some sense of the word, release ourselves from the strain that comes through the criticisms that have been made of our schools. When we report to the people of this country that we have large populations in our various educational institutions, I think we have not been altogether careful to explain to them that this change is a change which corresponds to the change that has been going on throughout society.

Unemployment of children began long before there was any unemployment of the type that has commonly been discussed in recent years.

I tried to show, then, in these two points that there has been a redistribution of our population, and I have tried to show that there has been a modification of the relation of our population to industry.

I should like now to turn to a third line of discussion. We are frequently criticized in the schools because we have expanded the curriculum. I know of no

criticism that has been more frequently voiced by those who support public educational institutions. I like to go over the history of some of the changes that have taken place in the curriculum of American schools, and I like to ask the question very pointedly, "What was the motive for the introduction of many of these new subjects?" I would like to review two or three examples, if I may.

Let me use an example that falls within my own personal experience as the first illustration. I went into a third grade some months ago and found the teacher and the children engaged in a little drama, the purpose of which was to teach children how to cross the street. I wonder if you could imagine, I wonder if those of us who went to school many years ago could possibly picture to ourselves the mirth that would have appeared in a citizens' committee if in our childhood there had been a suggestion that safety education be a part of the elementary school curriculum. In my boyhood it was no adventure to cross the street. Psychologically speaking, the reason why it was not an adventure was there wasn't anything on the street that moved with a rapidity that belonged to an entirely different class from the rapidity with which I could move. Today there is no need of elaborating the figure. You and I realize that children have got to be trained in the recognition of a rate of movement that passes anything that a human could equal. Where did this safety education come from, that is in the schools? I am sometimes sorry that we of the educational fraternity are not as inventive as is society. The answer to the question that I have raised about the source of this new element of the curriculum is very definite and very clear and capable of documentary support.

The answer is this: A group of hard-headed business men, directors of the casualty insurance companies of the

United States, organized for the purpose of protecting and promoting the business of casualty insurance companies. That body pays every year a very substantial sum of money to carry on a propaganda that shall bring it about that all of the schools of the United States introduce safety courses. This same organization is very proud of the fact that wherever their behest has been accepted and followed in the schools, the percentage of accidents is greatly reduced, and they are interested in the reduction of accidents both for humanitarian reasons and because the casualty insurance companies are very anxious to see accidents in this United States reduced.

Let us take another illustration: The American Bar Association is interested in the schools, so interested in the schools that it has organized in all of the local centers where its influence could reach, organizations known as Minute Men of the Constitution. These Minute Men of the Constitution have secured the passage of laws in all of our states to the effect that the Constitution of the United States must be taught in separate classes. Please note that last point. You may not teach the Constitution of the United States in satisfaction of this legal requirement in a class in history for, apparently in the mind of the Bar Association, that complicates the situation. You must not treat the Constitution of the United States as a section of physics. You must teach it in a separate class. This statement alone indicates that the Bar Association did not consult experienced educators, yet that law has been passed, as I say, and the obligation rests upon our common schools to teach the Constitution of the United States in a separate class, and the law makes no provision for additional time in which this additional material is to be incorporated into the curriculum. The law makes no provision whatsoever for special

training of teachers for the purpose of doing this work in a satisfactory fashion. This new subject came into the curriculum because the Bar Association made up its mind that the curriculum should be enlarged.

Take another illustration. There is an old New England virtue that certainly ought to be taught in the schools and was mildly taught, I take it, for many years in the schools. It is the virtue of thrift. But the organized bankers of the United States made up their minds that there was not enough instruction in thrift in the schools. I would like to pause and comment on their definition of thrift. Their definition of thrift is "Save your money and deposit it with us," and it will be more difficult in the future to carry on instruction in thrift along the lines suggested by the bankers than it has been in the past because there is a very large sum of money in the United States at the present time, saved by little children in the schools, in courses in thrift, and that money now is to be classified as frozen.

The fact is that we introduced this intensive treatment of thrift in the schools, call it a fad, if you like, call it a fancy, if you like, call it by any name you prefer, but we put it in at the command of the influential members of the community who are bankers.

I haven't begun yet with illustrations. If you go back in the history of this country you will find that the schools were told to give courses in agriculture, not only so but the federal government started out on a campaign of making institutions where agriculture could be cultivated and prepared for instruction, not only at the collegiate level but at the secondary level. I am not particularly interested in amplifying that statement, but I should like to get its complement in the fact that when the manufacturers, at the beginning of this century, found

that the federal government and our schools were so much concerned with agriculture, they came to the Congress of the United States and they said, "We want some instruction given to those who are to work in our shops and factories. We want vocational education." The manufacturers said this in no uncertain terms. They organized a special association. They went to Congress and asked for a commission. That commission was organized. That commission made a report, and in 1917 the Congress of the United States set aside a very substantial sum of money for the purpose of introducing into American schools, at the behest and command of the manufacturers, vocational courses that were based, in many instances, upon a very elaborate equipment. Machinery has gone into the secondary schools all over the United States because the manufacturers wanted these courses introduced into the schools of the United States.

When I hear anyone making a criticism today of the fact that machinery is very expensive in secondary schools and that vocational courses are very expensive, I am sorry that we do not have an opportunity to open up the page of history and make it perfectly clear that these expensive machine courses were put into the schools because of the demand of many of our leading citizens who today are critical of the schools because of this particular expense.

It seems to me that we ought to go back to our constituents and call attention to the fact that not only has society changed its distribution, not only is there a new epoch in industry, but there has come into the schools of the United States an entirely new attitude toward the curriculum, an attitude that is derived from the demands of practical people.

I might add to what I have said, when I have been discussing the explicit

demands of society for an enlargement of the curriculum, another type of demand that is perhaps a little less explicit but just as clear and definite. I wonder how many members of this company have ever tried to teach a class something that the class didn't want to learn. If you have ever had that experience, you know you proceed to modify the curriculum. The curriculum has been modified in the schools of the United States because, in addition, I say, to these explicit demands that have been made by groups of our citizens, our students have made demands upon us.

If you go back to that half a million young people in the secondary schools of the United States in 1900, and remember what it was that we gave them by way of a curriculum, when you remember that that was a selected group, all of the members of which were on the way to one of the learned professions, if you please, or at least the great majority of them were preparing to enter one of the learned professions, when you think of the contrast between the half million of selected secondary school pupils and the four and one-half million who are today in these schools, I think you begin to realize the utter impossibility of offering to four and one-half million young people the same kind of curriculum that was offered to the selected group at the beginning of this century.

We have had to enlarge the curriculum. We have enlarged the curriculum, and we have done it in the face of very grave difficulties, because society trained those of us who are in control of these schools today only in a partial way in preparation for this new demand. Teachers who were prepared in the classics have tried to acquire something of the art of teaching vocational subjects. Those who were trained in a classical mathematical curriculum have taken on

the modern sciences. We have tried even to cultivate some of the social sciences in which the earlier schools offered us no training at all.

The teachers have done what they could to meet the demand of a new population in the schools. There is no institution in the United States that has operated with more energy and more enthusiasm and, I might add, with greater success than have the schools in meeting the demand of modern civilization. The fact of the case is that these changes which we have introduced in the curriculum are not artificial changes that have been invented by someone in the schools for the purpose of the schools themselves. These changes that have come in the curriculum have been introduced because society is making new demands upon its generations, and with these new demands, expressed either by groups of citizens or by the students themselves, there comes the necessity, on the part of the school, of exerting itself in making new devices and new subjects of instruction that shall meet these demands.

When the Commissioner of Education makes his report in regard to the subjects that are taught in secondary schools, you find that in 1890 he could include all of the subjects under nine categories, and today his categories number forty-seven. The change has not been expressed clearly even in those figures, because these forty-seven categories that apply to modern secondary education are complex categories. You find, for example, under manual courses, all sorts of different courses of a technical sort, and you find these forty-seven categories more clearly defined in a statement which appears in the survey of the Land Grant Colleges where the contrast is between nine subjects taught in 1890 and two hundred and fifty different subjects taught in the modern secondary school.

The schools have attempted to keep pace with the demands of modern society.

Well, I have no more comment to make and it touches social trends not only in the United States but social trends in the modern world.

We have been in the habit of hearing the statement that somehow or other the American school has served American democracy. I like to think that statement is true. If you make a contrast between the American school just before the World War and the schools of Europe, you begin to have a realization of what you mean when you talk about the American school as a school of democracy.

All the European nations before the Great War had a stratified society, and they had a stratified school. They had a dual school system. A part of that dual school system, one branch of that dual school system, served the common people, and it was a meager branch. It offered nothing but rudimentary instruction. There was another branch of this dual school system for the elite, and that branch led up into the higher institutions. It was the exclusive privilege of the upper classes to enjoy secondary and higher education.

I say we in this country have thought of our school as democratic because there is no such stratification. If we study the movements that have been taking place in Europe since the Great War, I think we are confirmed in the belief that a unit school system, one which makes it possible for every child to begin at the beginning and go straight through to the highest opportunities of education, is the expression of a democracy. For all over Europe today you find democratic tendencies beginning to express themselves in school organization as well as in social organization.

You find Germany organizing a whole group of new secondary schools and

making secondary education available to the common people, to a degree which has never before been paralleled in the history of Germany. You find England opening more free places, making it possible for boys and girls who cannot pay a tuition for secondary education to enjoy the advantages of secondary education. And, above all, you find France making a move which is so democratic in character that it is almost impossible for us to understand its significance. One of the major political issues in France for the last three years has been the issue of making the successive years of the lycée free. The lycée is the exclusive home of that training which opens up the possibilities to a French boy of becoming a part of the government or the upper levels of society. Three years ago the radicals made the proposal in the House of Deputies that the first year of the lycée should be made free, and the conservatives opposed that measure with all the strength that they had, and they were defeated. Two years ago the radicals came forward with a new proposal. They said, "We want the second year of the lycée made free." And they added to their proposal that the second year of the lycée be made free, the further proposal that parents be paid for sending their children. That put the fear of God into the conservatives to such a degree that they voted the second year free. When it came to voting on the third year, the conservatives didn't offer any opposition, because they didn't know what the radicals might possibly invent. The third year of the lycée has been made free. There are only three years left, and you can count one by one the changes that will be made through the House of Deputies until the French lycée is made free. If you need any evidence that there are tendencies operating in the direction of democracy in the Old World, you can study these

changes in Germany and in France and in England. I might add that you can study in all the new countries similar tendencies. You can see Sweden reorganizing its whole school system.

If the American people need any confirmation of their belief that the schools of this country are democratic because they are unit school systems, let them study the changes that are going on abroad, because those changes make it perfectly clear that the whole world is moving in the direction of a possible organization of schools that shall open up to every boy and every girl the opportunity of a higher education, whatever be his or her rank or class in society.

The point I have tried to make, and may I repeat what I said at the outset, is this: I haven't been able to review the social tendencies that are exhibited in American civilization. That work has been done by specialists in a fashion that I think should attract the attention of every educator. Every change that

has taken place in society is paralleled by a change which takes place in the institution which prepares young people to live in modern society. Every one of these changes has tended to deepen our enthusiasm for the kind of school system which we have been trying to organize, and I believe that the people of this country, as soon as they begin to understand this situation in which we are at the present time, when curtailment after curtailment is being worked out in the legislatures and in local communities charging the school with extravagance, charging the school with artificial enlargement of the curriculum—I say when our people come to really understand the situation, I believe there will come from the common man who I think has not been heard from in full with regard to the demands for opportunities for his children, a pronouncement that is in keeping with our belief that the American school is one of the great institutions of this nation and one that should and will be defended and further enlarged.

HOW TO USE THE FINDINGS OF THE NATIONAL SURVEY OF SECONDARY EDUCATION¹

LEONARD V. KOOS
The University of Chicago

IN ALL likelihood most listeners tonight already know that the monographs of the National Survey of Secondary Education have begun to come from the press. At this writing six of the total of 28 monographs based on the investigations of the Survey have found their way into print. Proofs of many others have been read. At the present rate at which the reports are appearing the full list should be available by the early autumn. With a number of monographs already available and the remainder shortly to appear it seems opportune to point out the manner in which the reports and their findings may to advantage be used.

While referring to the availability of the reports it is appropriate to mention the very modest price that has been set on them. Of the entire list of 28 monographs 19 or being sold at ten cents each, 6 at 15 cents, 1 at 20 cents, and 2 (each of these containing between 400 and 500 pages) at 40 cents. The charge made by the Government Printing Office for the entire list of 28 monographs, totaling more than four thousand printed pages, is \$3.80. The explanation of such "depression prices" is the fact that the cost of the original edition including plates was an item in the budget of the Survey. Purchasers are paying only for the cost of paper and impression. The monographs are on sale by the Superintendent of Documents in Washington. A list of the monographs with prices will be supplied free of cost on request to the Office of Education, Washington.

Lest there should still be a few among you who do not know about the Survey, it may be said that the National Survey is a three-year investigation of secondary education throughout the country, authorized by Congress in February, 1929. At that time an appropriation of \$225,000 was made to the federal Office of Education for carrying on the Survey. The work of investigation was completed July 1 of last year and engaged the services of 30 specialists and a total staff of about 60 different persons. In connection with the investigation almost 200,000 blanks of inquiry were distributed and 850 visits made to schools, these visits entailing approximately 200,000 miles of travel. It is the results of this large-scale investigation that is being reported in the monographs to which reference has been made.

CHECKING THE LOCAL SITUATION AGAINST THE FINDINGS

In the brief time allotted I should like to consider and illustrate two types of use of the reports and findings of the Survey. The first of these is not a usual one for surveys, but was clearly contemplated at the outset by being projected as one of the guiding principles of the Survey. At their earliest meetings to confer over the outlines and procedures of the whole project the consultants (who virtually served as a committee of advisers) urged that investigations should be conducted by procedures which could with advantage be duplicated in the local school situations (or the findings of which could be used as a check on local

¹A paper prepared for delivery before the North Central Association in March, 1933.—THE EDITOR.

practices or conditions). Most of the projects of the Survey include investigations that comply with this principle and the findings of which are applicable in this way.

At the risk of being tedious I desire to illustrate generously this manner of use of the report and findings of the Survey. The first monograph to be drawn upon in this way was among the earliest to be published, the one entitled "Instruction in English." I choose this report because it is in a field with which all members of this audience have made some contact and with which all have vital concern. In common with other investigators in the subject-fields, Dr. Dora V. Smith, who prepared the report, based it on an analysis of recently revised course outlines and first-hand observation of classroom work. To be exact, we may report that Dr. Smith analyzed 156 course outlines for use in junior and senior high schools revised since 1925 and visited classes in 70 junior and senior high schools in 15 different states, the schools visited having been previously identified as doing the unusual in one or more aspects of the program of instruction in English. Thus, the whole investigation in English had to do with practices in schools with forward-looking programs in the field.

The monograph on "Instruction in English" contains, among others, chapters on time allotments to literature and composition, the teaching of composition, the teaching of grammar, the teaching of reading and literature, cooperation and correlation, the provisions for individual differences. The whole body of evidence is reported in such a way as to facilitate checking local practices against the practices in these forward-looking programs.

(1) The time allotments to literature and composition show a steadily increasing average proportion devoted to liter-

ature from Grade VII to Grade XII, but the reduction in the proportion devoted to composition is far from approaching its elimination. In fact, the time allotment to composition in senior high-school grades in these schools is greater than that in typical schools. It would be easy for persons in any local school situation to note any deviation there from practice in this regard in the schools represented in the report.

(2) The chapter on the teaching of composition includes sections on the general and specific aims in this work found in the revised course outlines. Proportionate frequencies are reported for junior and for senior high-school grades. Further along in the chapter is a similar analysis of the objectives in oral composition. Recurrent and unusual pupil activities in the work in composition are reported, as well as of types of organization of instruction. A list of special courses in composition at the senior high-school level is reported, among these being creative writing, journalism, newspaper advertising, and short-story writing. Local practice can readily be investigated along similar lines and checked against the background provided by the practices in this group of innovating schools.

(3) The chapter on the teaching of reading and literature contains, among other materials, the results of an analysis of objectives made along lines similar to those followed with the objectives of composition, distinguishing also between objectives proposed for junior and for senior high-school grades. It reports the frequencies of use in each grade of the different methods of organizing the literary selections for instructional purposes, as by literary types, theme, unitary organization, objectives, mere lists of classics, and diverse combinations of these different bases. It reports the teaching topics mentioned in 120 lesson plans

reproduced in the course outlines. With respect to the teaching of literature, as to the teaching of composition, it is possible for individuals in local schools to check their own practices against practices in these presumably innovating schools.

(4) Many course outlines in English were found to include reference to provisions for individual differences, such as ability grouping with multiple-track programs, the core course with variations, multiple-reading programs, electives, remedial courses, modified-content courses, seminars for superior pupils, special programs for over-age pupils, and differentiation in methods of instruction. This list of provisions, also, can serve as a check-list for local school workers desirous of noting their own progress in these directions.

(5) Scattered through the monograph are brief descriptions of unusual and less frequent innovations. One encounters the "functional-center" organization of instruction in composition as exemplified in Highland Park, Michigan, and in Denver; the use of the school paper and the literary magazine as avenues for creative writing, as seen in the Starr King Junior High School in Los Angeles; the use of the radio as the center of interesting expressional activities, as in the Jefferson Junior High School in Cleveland; the exhaustive study of some interesting hobby, as in the Havermale Junior High School in Spokane; individualized reading programs in the Libby Junior High School in the same city; the free-reading movement to be found in several schools; the dramatic-arts courses in the University High School of Oakland, where all departments of the school contribute to the performance in hand; the program by which all teachers in the school, irrespective of subject, unite in a study of common errors in speech and writing, as at Janesville, Wisconsin; and

the experiments in integration of English and other subjects, as in Lincoln and Horace Mann Schools at Teachers College, Columbia University. This discovery of the unusual in individual schools provides one of the most constructive sources of suggestion to be found in the report.

Of course, Dr. Smith does not assume that all the trends and innovating practices disclosed in her investigation are uniformly constructive. However, it is probably safe to conclude that among these trends and practices are to be found many changes that will have great positive influence on instruction in English during the next several years. The trends and innovating practices are, therefore, deserving of careful consideration by local school people with a view to adopting or adapting them in the local situations. Dr. Smith makes sure to bring to bear on them the findings of researches and her expert judgment in the field, to the end that the trends and practices may be as far as possible approved in the light of present knowledge. However, she goes further in suggesting in her closing chapter various lines of inquiry investigation of which by methods of research will extend the boundaries of appraisal in many directions.

I should like to present one other illustration of the first type of use of findings of the Survey. This instance is one pertaining to the findings of the monograph on the Program of Studies which was prepared by Drs. Arthur K. Loomis and Edwin S. Lide. The present instance represents an actual use of certain findings of this report. The monograph, not yet in print, will be a substantial one reporting trends in subjects required, offered, and actually taken by pupils in junior, senior, and four-year high schools. The instance of use to be cited is the paralleling for other schools than those represented in the monograph

of a portion of the original investigation inquiring into the subjects which had been taken during their high-school careers by certain groups of recent graduates. The parallel study was made for a group of 28 suburban high schools in the region about Chicago and was executed recently by Drs. Loomis and Reavis.

The computations of their study paralleling the project of the Survey eventuated in percentages of credit earned by the graduates in certain subject-groups, namely, English, the social studies, foreign languages, mathematics, science, and the non-academic subjects. The significance of the repetition of the study for the new group of schools may be suggested by drawing illustratively on the percentages for three of these subject groups. In one of the 28 schools the percentage of credit earned in the social studies by a group of girl graduates who did not enter college was 8.1. The percentage in the same subject-field for a corresponding group of girl graduates of a school at the other extreme was 23.4—almost three times as large a proportion as for the lowest school. The median percentage for the 28 schools was 15.1. Such a comparison must prompt those responsible for the school with the lowest percentage to wonder whether the program of studies as administered by them is giving adequate recognition to the obligations for civic-social training in secondary education. The answer, of course, is not to be found within the evidence of such a study, but the findings can be expected to stimulate the deliberation over the issues involved that will aid in arriving at the appropriate answer. A few more percentages for other subject-fields for the same groups of graduates not entering college are similarly provocative: for one school the percentage of credit in mathematics was 5.4, while for the school at the other extreme it was 17.4; for one

school the percentage in non-academic subjects (commercial work, the practical arts, music, and the like) was 14.1, while in the school at the other extreme it was 6.9, or almost half.

This first type of use of the findings of the Survey, in which the procedures of the Survey are applied in the local situation and local conditions are checked against those found in the selected schools of the country as a whole, is limited only by the scope of the Survey, which is admittedly wide. This means that such use illustrated for English may be extended to subject fields like the social studies, science, mathematics, foreign languages, music, and art, in which studies comparable to that in English were made. It may also be extended to such major aspects or problems in the whole field of secondary education as procedures in curriculum-making, the extra-curriculum, athletics, health and physical education, the program of guidance, vocational education, part-time education, the secondary-school population, junior high-school reorganization, the smaller secondary schools, selection and appointment of teachers, provisions for individual differences, marking, promotion, library service, and articulation of high school and college. Great good can come from frequent recourse to the reports and findings of the Survey in such comparative studies. This type of utilization of the reports and findings should be an exceedingly practical one, in that it should be stimulative of improvement in the schools.

UTILIZING THE MAJOR IMPLICATIONS

The second use of the findings of the National Survey to which I wish to refer is the much more obvious one of relying on the major implications of the various projects. Practically all the investigations have yielded implications of this type, although they may not always have been

labeled in this way. It is necessary to resort here again to illustration only, as it is manifestly out of the question to cite in a single brief presentation any large number of the major inferences. I select for illustration projects dealing with provisions for individual differences and the problem of smaller secondary schools, both dealing with timely and prevalent concerns. I must ask you to bear in mind that to extract a few implications from two only in a list of 28 monographs covering a wide range of topics pertaining to secondary education will give only a meager notion of the Survey in this aspect of its usefulness.

One of the larger projects of the Survey, directed by Dr. Roy O. Billett, endeavored to ascertain the extent of, and to analyze the provisions for individual differences made in ten thousand secondary schools. In view of the recent tremendous influx of youth into secondary-school grades there can be no question of the exceptional timeliness of such a study. The projects discovered a great array of provisions for individual differences, not yet as generally practiced as seems desirable, but indicative at least of a general recognition of the problem. Critical analysis by Dr. Billett reduced this wide array to what he calls three "core elements of a typically successful program to provide for individual differences, namely, homogeneous, or ability, grouping, special classes for the very bright or gifted and for the slow, and the unit assignment. This is one of the major inferences from the whole study, a conclusion of pervasive significance. It may be said in passing that special classes for the gifted or the slow pupils, the second of the three "core elements," may be thought of as a type of homogeneous grouping, the first of the three. The facts show that these classes are provided about nine times as often for slow pupils as for the very bright.

The study of procedures characterized by the unit assignment, which are among the most frequent provisions for individual differences, led to one of the most significant inferences of this part of the Survey. These procedures are known by a confusingly wide variety of names, among the most frequent being the "Dalton plan," "Winnetka technique," "Morrison plan," "differentiated assignments," "long-unit assignments," "individualized instruction," "contract plan," "laboratory plan," "problem method," and "project method." A notable fact about the first three of these procedures is that the practices carried on in schools reporting to use them with unusual success deviated widely from the characteristics of the plans as described by their originators—in differing degrees for the different procedures.

A rather startling conclusion concerning the remaining seven in the list, namely, differentiated assignments, long-unit assignments, individualized instruction, contract plan, laboratory plan, problem method, and project method, is that detailed analysis of practices in schools reporting to use them with unusual success finds these practices to be essentially identical, no matter what name is applied. A significant implication here is that terminology is needlessly elaborate and complex and that the educational world will be better off if it discards most of this jargon. The implication is no denial that the unit assignment is distinctly serviceable in providing for individual differences; the report of the project concludes that it is, and recommends a practical and simplified clarification of the issues involved. From this citation of conclusions it may be noted that major conclusions are utilizable in formulating the policies of a school or system.

The other project to be drawn upon in illustration of the usefulness of major inferences from the Survey is concerned

with smaller secondary schools. This project was done in collaboration by Professor Emery N. Ferriss of Cornell, W. H. Gaumnitz of the regular staff of the Office of Education, and P. Roy Brammell, a full-time member of the Survey staff. In essence this project involved a comparison of selected and unselected small secondary schools. The list of selected schools was made up from results of inquiries sent to state supervisors of high schools and professors of secondary education in higher institutions and from descriptions in educational literature of unusual small schools. The unselected schools represented as nearly a random group of small schools as could be induced to respond to the inquiry forms devised to secure the information needed. Each of the two classes of schools, the unselected and the selected, was divided into groups according to size of enrollment, and comparisons of the schools made size by size with respect to many features that go to make up a school. A host of specific conclusions were drawn from this large project, but reference here will be made to two major implications only.

A manifest conclusion from an overview of the evidence of the project pertains to the all but fully consistent superiority of the selected over the unselected schools represented. To be sure, it is an *average* superiority of one class over the other, rather than the superiority of all selected schools over all unselected schools; among schools of equivalent enrollments many unselected schools are indubitably better in some respects than many selected schools. Nevertheless, the general trend of superiority is too marked to be gainsaid.

The selected schools are in larger districts than are unselected schools of equivalent enrollments. They are more often in consolidated districts. They more often provide transportation, and provide it

for a larger number of pupils. They retain pupils better—at least when they are reorganized schools. Their class periods are longer. They more often provide the service of part-time librarians, and these librarians have had more training for their work than part-time librarians in unselected schools. Their principals are better trained both with respect to the total duration of training and the amount of work taken in the special field of education. The tenure of these principals is longer, their teaching loads are more reasonable, and their salaries higher. In material facilities the selected schools are better provided, particularly in such matters as size of grounds, service equipment, special rooms, space and equipment for librarians, equipment for motion and still pictures, and free textbooks. They are superior with respect to instruction in that they have more often in recent years made certain additions to the curriculum, are making more frequent use of newer methods of teaching, and are carrying on a greater range of supervisory activities. In the extra-curriculum, in pupil-accounting and guidance, in extending their educational service and in their community relationships they have gone farther than have the unselected schools. In two respects only are the unselected schools on a par with the selected schools, namely, in the tenure and in the salaries of teachers.

Thus, the first general implication from all the evidence is that, *if the selected schools are providing the facilities or carrying on the activities represented in these aspects of superiority, other schools of the same size may well be expected to do the same.* The whole study has not, to be sure, gone into the question of the local financial resources available to the unselected and selected schools in order to ascertain whether the selected schools are better off financially than the unselected schools. It is almost certain that

the selected schools were superior in this respect as well as in others. If this were found to be true, the problem would become one of equalization of educational opportunities and stimulation by the state. In these times of a rather general acceptance of the principle of state equalization and stimulation, it seems appropriate to concede that to some extent incorporating the features of a good school in small communities should be made feasible by the state, especially if the principle is not carried so far as to minimize too greatly the advantage of size also demonstrated in this investigation.

An implication subordinate to that just stated, but important nevertheless, pertains to the significance of educational leadership in the smaller schools. The study has shown that principals in the selected schools on the average have more extended training, hold higher degrees, and have had more work in the field of education. Besides, they have longer tenure and receive higher salaries. It seems more than likely that many of the other superiorities reported for the selected schools are directly attributable to the greater competence of the heads of these schools reflected in the evidence on these points. Although relationships in this regard are doubtless reciprocal, and although better schools would to some extent attract better leadership, one can hardly doubt that some of the superiority of the selected schools has resulted from superior competence of the school heads. It is worth mentioning in passing that the superiority has been accomplished despite a level of salaries of teachers no higher than that in unselected schools. Unquestionably, one of the first approaches in the effort to improve a small school must be to place it in charge of a competent leader.

A second conclusion from the evidence of the whole study is with respect

to the significance of size of school. The fact is that *the differences between the measures reported for one size-group and the next largest among the unselected schools are typically greater than between that size-group and the corresponding size-group among the selected schools*. This conclusion has the corroboration of an important finding of the project of the Survey relating to the reorganization of secondary education, a finding which is to the effect that, as concerns schools with smaller enrollments, size is a more potent factor of the extent of reorganization than type of organization. The conclusion from the present investigation is another way of saying that *size is a more important factor than selection* in making for constructive differences among small schools. It would be difficult, if not impossible, to conceive of a conclusion more momentous for the problem of the small high school.

The obvious implication from this finding is that the very small high schools ought to be kept to as small a number as possible. This implication has meaning for all who deal with the problem of small schools, whether they are persons in the localities where these small schools are operating or contemplated or whether they have to do with the determination of state policy in the establishment and maintenance of schools. State policy can be exceedingly influential here and should encourage the establishment only of high schools of good size. Doubtless in most states there are sparsely settled areas that should be provided with secondary-school opportunities even if enrollments are small, but these should be looked upon as atypical developments. After authorization, such schools should be aided in providing the features of a good institution, as suggested above in discussing the first major implication from the study, but the normal and basic assumptions should be that it is easier to

provide a good school where a sizable enrollment is assured, and that to maintain a good school with a small enrollment is always an uphill and often impossible task.

While considering the major implications of this project dealing with the smaller secondary schools we may note again the usefulness of these implications in arriving at fundamental policies in schools and school systems.

FOR WHOM THE FINDINGS ARE USEFUL

Two types of uses of the reports and findings of the Survey have been illustrated, albeit scantily,—one in the nature of checking the local situation against practices and conditions found in forward-looking schools and the other being that of applying the major implications of the projects. Resort to these uses should have a beneficial and widespread influence on the practices and policies of the schools. A word should perhaps be said concerning the groups of school workers for whom the findings should prove most useful. It is probably gratuitous to say that the findings will be useful chiefly to those responsible for our secondary schools, more specifically administrative officers and teachers. All the monographs have meaning for principal and superintendent. The significance for the teachers is perhaps not quite as universal, except in the teacher's general understanding of and professional relationships to the school. These are unquestionably important. The full list of monographs, however, includes a number replete with specific meaning for the classroom teacher, among them those dealing with provisions for individual differences, the programs of guidance, the library, the program of studies, the several subject-groups, and the non-athletic extra-curriculum activities. Many of the monographs will have meaning for those at work in elementary and higher schools.

The report on articulation of high school and college should be of special interest to those at work in higher institutions. To the professors of education, particularly those emphasizing secondary education, the entire list should be useful. These should find much content pertinent to their courses, both for lectures and student readings. The summary monograph, which will be among the last to be published, has been planned for those who care only for an overview of the Survey, including the intelligent layman.

Among the methods, other than individual reading of the monographs, by which the findings of the reports may be brought to the attention of those most concerned, are study and discussion of the reports at educational meetings. Teachers' meetings in individual schools can profitably be based on them and sectional meetings of educational associations should find them suitable for presentations and discussions. At sessions of educational associations devoted to consideration of the reports the presence of members of the Survey staff will be helpful, but not indispensable.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF SUCH A SURVEY OF EDUCATION

In bringing this discussion of the use of the findings of the Survey to a close I should like once more to emphasize the fact that in this three-year study attention has been given chiefly to serious efforts at innovation. On this account, as I have repeatedly pointed out before this and other groups, readers of the report will see passed in review the vast array of practices which have been introduced in order to effect improvement in the schools of this country. Unlike Europe with its national centralization of control of education, we have as many systems of schools and centers of control as we have states. Added to the diversity

of practice is the fact that most of the states have allowed their local systems a great deal of freedom to initiate and to experiment. At the same time that, as a nation, we have decentralization of control in education, we aim to foster in all these states the same ideals. How essential it is then for those responsible for the schools in one state or locality to have made known to them the nature and direction of progress in the schools of other states and localities! This is the peculiar service of the National Survey of Secondary Education. By examining its reports those at work in any community or state in schools at the secondary level will be able to note the progress and trends at that level in all states and sections and will in consequence be able to give more comprehensive and systematic consideration to the next steps to be taken in improving their own practices.

I cannot refrain from saying a word in conclusion concerning the possible bearing of the findings of the Survey on the steps taken toward retrenchment in the schools during the present economic recession. It is a frequent experience that during periods of financial distress those features of the school that have last been added are among the first to go when resources decline. In such times these novel features are dubbed "fads and frills," when in fact they are often more necessary than the features not assailed—features which are retained because of the hold of tradition long after they have outlived their usefulness. We should look carefully into the proposals to eliminate these latest developments in the schools. The report of the National Survey of Secondary Education is appearing in time to be of aid in determining what sacrifices should be made.

THE TEACHER AND THE SURVEY IN MUSIC IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS¹

ANNE E. PIERCE
University of Iowa

THE report on music in the National Survey of Secondary Education, whose origin lies in the interest of the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, aims to give a picture of general instructional status and suggestive innovations as found in the year 1931. It endeavors to describe tendencies as they existed at the time the Survey was made, and in so doing, it reflects both lights and shadows.

To teachers and others engaged in curriculum building, its pages may be particularly interesting in searching for past truths to determine the future drift of this subject, or if wishing guidance in formulating plans. For surely the experience and practice of others of like mind should serve as guide-posts as to what should or what should not be done. Indeed, it is a self-evident truth that the road "by example is short and efficacious," although implicit in its interpretation should be the observation of the sage that it is equally well "to learn from the misfortunes of others what should be avoided."

The survey of music takes into consideration surveys and studies made prior to its inauguration in order to lend perspective and background to its findings. These findings were based primarily upon an examination of courses of study to discover what were the avowed purposes and customs in teaching this subject; upon correspondence and conferences with teachers as to actual practice; and upon observation of classroom

procedure in thirty systems ranging in location from the eastern seaboard to the west coast, in schools where high excellence has been achieved. All these have fortified and supplemented the data from each other. The conclusions which emerge the report endeavors to describe and analyze.

It need not be called to the attention of the readers of this article that music in the high school has attained its present virility only within the past few years—years which have witnessed its expansion from compulsory chorus meeting once or twice a week, without credit, to credited offerings in theory, history, appreciation, instrumental and vocal music. No longer is it considered a subject for which public money should not be expended by the thrifty citizen, for, by 1926, it had assumed proportions exceeding those of drawing and art, home economics, Latin, French, German, Spanish, geometry, physics, chemistry, shorthand or typewriting,¹ and, in 1927, professional educators at the meeting of the Department of Superintendence recommended that everywhere it be given equal consideration and support with other basic subjects.²

This expansion, within so brief a span of years, has witnessed a change in the concept of why music should receive a place in the schedule of courses, no less

¹Carl A. Jessen, "Secondary Education," *Biennial Survey of Education*, 1926-28. U.S. Office of Education Bulletin, 1930, No. 16. Washington: Government Printing Office.

²Department of Superintendence, *Official Report*, 1927, p. 318. Washington: National Education Association, 1927.

¹A paper prepared for delivery before the North Central Association in March, 1933.—THE EDITOR.

amazing than the growth in the number of its offerings. Formerly included for its so-called disciplinary values, its chief purpose of late is held to provide a cultural means of increasing pleasure particularly in leisure time, thus extending its influence beyond the confines of the schoolroom into the life of the community at large.

There is reason to believe that this tempo of change may be as great in the future as in the recent past, particularly in that realm of music which satisfies man's leisure moments, for present economic conditions will undoubtedly increase the number of hours free from work through an enforced shorter work-day. This means that the teacher in the schools can no longer give obeisance to the purely technical which trains solely for vocation, but must evolve plans designed to care for the great mass of citizens who are consumers of music rather than producers, and for that smaller group who wish to cultivate musical talent from the standpoint of the amateur performer.

With this broader view in the fore, effort to integrate school music with social life attendant at the time should make the development of appreciation as well as skills a part of a larger cultural growth. Of course, this is intrinsically a matter of teachers and of the general spirit of the school; and unquestionably a wise teacher imbued with the "spirit" of music can bring about the desired result more effectively than a combination of textbooks and courses of study. Yet good textbooks and writing plans should in no sense be discounted for they not only set forth definite material to be presented and mastered, but unify the work for the periods for which they are designed. Furthermore, through far-sighted aims or objectives written plans, in particular, make for an accumulation of subject matter and progressive de-

velopment. Moreover, it must be conceded that they mirror the ideas and ideals of a special craft and indicate to a considerable degree the status and trend of musical education. Therefore, of special significance to teachers is the consideration given in the report of the ninety-six courses of study, which include twelve state courses prepared from 1924 to 1931 and eighty-four city courses ranging in date from 1916 to 1931, because in them are reflected not only attainable heights but also pitfalls to be avoided, both in the junior and senior organization and in the older type of administrative division.

Although in no sense does the report depict in detail all the factors attendant upon the making of a course of study, it may be of service in showing ways and means by which some music educators have endeavored to attain ends desired. It is not possible here to indicate all the conclusions compelling attention, but it is important to point out that those courses which most nearly approximate newer tendencies of general educational practice subscribe to aims or objectives classified as general and specific. In adopting the former, it is assumed that they state the purposes of music as a whole, whereas the latter are accepted as particularly pertinent or fitted to separate courses in the music curriculum or to subdivisions of single courses. Yet unfortunately a well-defined distinction between general and specific is not always found—a point which teachers constructing new courses might well bear in mind.

In addition, the statement of organization of subject-matter and the subject-matter itself are not always wrought in the mold of purposes announced, nor do successive years in the music curriculum always evolve accumulations of information. Not all organizations of subject matter demonstrate purposes of meeting

the emerging problems of educating youth musically which present themselves in a changing world, although this is not true of all courses. Teachers interested in the construction of courses of study will also discover that the report describes a variance in the form of the presentation of subject matter, from outline, discussion, topic, unit or problem in the fields of history, appreciation, theory, instrumental and vocal offerings. In courses of study the type of material listed often indicates to a large degree the character of the work. For example, those interested will discover that compositions suggested for instrumental and vocal groups determine to a great extent the quality and trend of the content, and, where courses offer lists of materials for all subjects included in the music department, a practical help for increasing one's own body of information may be found.

But only so far as these practices look forward rather than backward should they be adopted and transmitted. A course should not be considered sacrosanct, for it cannot be too strongly emphasized that tradition is a good servant but a poor master. Experimentation and trial before final adoption without doubt presage success more certainly than the written plan which is untested. This truth has been recognized in some of the outstanding schools of the country which are thus by example serving the cause of better instruction in music. Good courses of study sometimes contain definite and detailed recommendations as to the character of procedure and materials to be used, but there should be enough elasticity in any course to permit adaptation to new conditions which arise, which, at the present time, in some communities includes provision for contests and festivals as well as the radio.

In this connection it may be pointed

out that contests and festivals have stimulated in no small degree the development of performance organizations, such as orchestras, bands, glee clubs, choruses, cappella choirs, and small ensemble groups. However, courses of study do not often carry detailed pronouncements on this phase of the program in music.

The reader of the Survey may note also the mention of the various devices utilized by the teacher in promoting the acquisition of musical information, such as the effort of some instructors to correlate or associate the study of music with other offerings in the curriculum, a movement without doubt indicating a desire on the part of builders of the curriculum to broaden the scope of human knowledge.

In a day when the individual's training and growth many determine as never before his future as a contributor to a complex social structure, provision to care for individual differences is of paramount importance. Courses of study sometimes reveal a recognition of this educational problem by offering instruction in fields for which the individual has a special aptitude, by the organization of subject matter for groups of varied abilities, by allowance of credit for study pursued outside the schools, and by a variety of offerings planned to care for individual development and interests, and by testing, especially in performance classes. Teachers desirous of evolving a testing program will find through a reading of the Survey that standardized tests as aids in the discovery of musical achievement and aptitude receive slight acknowledgement not only in the courses of study but in actual classroom practice. However, a notable exception is described in the report, which proves the field can be cultivated.

One of the pitfalls which it might seem wise to avoid is particularly evident in

the section of the report which indicates the lack of gradation in the selection of subject matter, for schools sometimes present the same type of course at higher and lower levels. Furthermore, a wide variety of titles of courses listed bear witness to a lack of definiteness in nomenclature, for an examination of the subject matter often shows striking similarity and at times duplication. This adds to a confusion present in assigning credits for the study of music—acknowledged a considerable problem not only by the teacher but by the general school administrator.

Since teachers themselves avowedly are the greatest force in constructing the course of study, in which assistance to some extent has been rendered by educational experts, it is assumed that jointly these two forces may find of some value the conditions which an examination of these written plans reveal.

Besides the section allotted to course-of-study construction, the teacher wishing to learn how teaching is being carried on throughout the country will find methods of teaching discussed in some detail. Particularly helpful should be the paragraphs describing classes visited where individuality and resourcefulness were exercised, although the Survey reveals that the greater number of teachers used procedures tending to be of a formal type, following fixed and inflexible lesson plans from which there is little likelihood of departure. However, those teachers who were not blind adherents to traditional forms, and who employed an informal procedure which permitted pupil spontaneity and initiative in the direction and acquisition of information, provide examples worthy of study. Yet it should be said that good and poor teaching were evident in both types of presentation and there were modifications of both which were used effectively.

Without doubt the large number of

offerings in music sometimes open to secondary school pupils attest the desire of those engaged in teaching to widen its scope and usefulness. However, an expanding curriculum to care for the varied interests and abilities of boys and girls is only one avenue this phase of education may take. Problems of content of courses and methods of instruction present other paths, as vital in importance, in which experimentation and research are necessary to insure progress.

Most of us at all times are willing to carry on in manner and form which are held acceptable, for it is generally agreed that old ideas and plans should not yield until they are replaced by others equally as attractive and appealing. There is wisdom in the effort to retain some of the well-tried schemes of the past for some of them are useful and tend to the benefit of the individual or the group. Others, which were once useful, however, sometimes become obsolete, and, when they become so, new theories and plans should supplant them.

Many, no doubt, are satisfied with the instruction of music as it now is while others recognize that it occasionally must undergo modification. Certainly present economic and social conditions indicate that a constancy of status cannot be depended upon and that the teacher must be willing to adjust his instruction from time to time as change descends on him. Truly, no system can rest upon its past alone. It must meet the needs of the present and develop a future if it is to occupy an important place in the domain of useful education.

Surely the molds of thought and the forms of teaching have not all been exhausted by the thinkers of the past. There are other alternatives than those commonly subscribed to by the mass of teachers of the present, some of which may contain germs of usefulness hither-

to unrealized. Fortunately there are, in the guild of music teachers, adventurers into the new, who are forging new ways in their field of teaching. To forward-looking teachers searching for novel approaches to the subject, the section in the report dealing with innovations in teaching may be suggestive. In this connection it may be well to point out that compared with the music given in high schools in the early years of the century many of the courses of the present may, to a great extent, be considered novelties. And many innovations connected with its administration and instruction may be called experimental in the sense that they are recent and as yet not thoroughly established in the school plan, such as the use of the radio, contests, festivals and concerts.

Nowhere will the teacher of music seeking new and fertile fields of experimentation find greater opportunity for modification and change than in the general music course commonly required in the junior high school and in the ninth grade of the four-year high school, which many times becomes merely a continuation of the elementary grade school work. The report describes how several teachers have attempted to adapt this course to the newer administrative division and to the needs and interests of pupils enrolled; such, for example, as the modeling of a course in one school to fit pupils' interests and activities through a definite correlation of music with other subjects with the desire to enrich the offering in music, particularly for those pupils without special musical talent. Other instances with a like purpose might be cited including the work in one school whose approach was through the historical and creative, while still another introduced a scientific study of the subject in an effort to have music function properly in the secondary educational process.

At the senior level of instruction, the experimental activities of some teachers are focused on a new content and a new method of presenting history and appreciation of music, harmony, vocal and instrumental classes. The effectiveness of such efforts was manifest in many of the music classes observed. Instrumental and vocal groups sometimes performed in a manner deserving high praise while courses in the appreciation and theory of music fulfilled their purposes well.

The section on equipment may likewise show the importance some schools are placing upon music as a part of the program of offerings and may provide suggestions as to desirable furnishings, for those who need guidance on this point.

Thus, the report on music, it is hoped, may be of use to teachers and others interested in the promotion and betterment of music instruction in the schools. It does not attempt to gloss over defects nor to ignore the high class of work going forward in many school systems. Both good and poor practices are found, —a condition not surprising in a subject whose growth has been so rapid and, it should be added, a condition which is probably true of all other branches of high school instruction. But such explanations provide little justification for faults. Granting that music offers peculiar problems (which is also often said to be true of other school subjects), it must accept and embody the principles of education if it is to receive the recognition on the school program its advocates desire. Objectives adapted to the subject and the secondary school should be determined, and courses of study should be planned with well-considered and well-formulated ideals made effective through a subject-matter adapted to individual needs and differences. Credit allowance for work in music should be rescued from its present chaotic state and a sensible

relationship between time allotment and the granting of credits established. Some of the points enumerated as needing attention are not so deeply ingrained that they cannot be rectified, nor can all be laid at the door of either music teacher or school administrator. Each has his special responsibility. But cooperative consideration and endeavor on the part of both are necessary to effect change. The one is essential to the other.

In concluding these remarks it may perhaps be well to repeat that this report is not designed to enter into a detailed discussion of all the factors involved in present-day instruction in this subject. It is hoped that through this treatment, though brief, teachers may become aware of the place music can and does hold in the life of the school and com-

munity. It is also hoped that it will arouse in them a desire to correct and overcome some of the defects often apparent in music instruction. Perhaps those reading the report of the Survey may have their attention directed into channels which will lead them to inquire: What is to be the goal of training in music for the youth of America soon to enter upon the duties of adult life? Is reorganization necessary or desirable, and if so, to what end should it be directed? With what values is it to be associated? From what purpose or spirit is its dynamic force to be derived? How shall we reconcile skills and appreciation heretofore generally developed with the values of everyday life in an economic and social organism obviously now undergoing change?

THE SCHOOL ADMINISTRATOR AND THE SECONDARY SCHOOL LIBRARY¹

B. LAMAR JOHNSON
Stephens College, Columbia, Missouri

THE report² of the library project of the National Survey of Secondary Education is intended primarily to be of service to three groups: first, school administrators; second, teachers in secondary schools; and third, librarians.

Early in the survey, groups of persons acquainted with school libraries in the various sections of the nation were asked to report the names of high schools having unusual library service. To 620 schools thus recommended inquiry forms were sent asking each to report regarding the school library, its administration, its equipment, and its staff. Throughout the inquiry form, emphasis was given to the fact that mention and description of innovations in the service of the high school library and its administration were particularly desired. Inquiry forms were returned by 390 schools located in 46 states and the District of Columbia. These forms were studied carefully for the purpose of locating noteworthy practices. By this means 44 schools in 15 states were selected to be visited. Usually one day was spent in each school, and every effort was made to get information regarding devices and activities reported to be helpful in the solution of secondary school library problems.

THE LIBRARY-STUDY HALL

A problem that must be faced in any school which has a library is that of the

relation of the library to the study hall. Ought the library be separate from the study hall? Or, ought the library be combined with the study hall? Data in the bulletin throw considerable light on this problem. Principals and librarians of 390 schools included in the investigation indicate divergence of opinion regarding the combined library and study hall. In general, however, it may be said that librarians look with disfavor on the combination plan, and that principals are approximately equally divided in their attitude toward this plan.

The objections most frequently voiced to the library-study hall combination are that this arrangement causes the library to be overcrowded, that it creates a disciplinary problem, and that it brings about an atmosphere of formality in the library. Advantages claimed for the combination plan are that it insures regular contact with the library for all pupils and that it destroys the formal atmosphere usually found in study halls.

The report includes, however, more than the opinions of principals and librarians regarding the combination of library and study hall. The claim that the library-study hall plan is advantageous because it gives pupils regular contact with the library is based on the supposition that repeated and regular contact with library materials encourages the use of such materials. In order to inquire into the validity of this assumption, 17,463 pupils in 24 schools were asked to indicate upon a simple checking list whether they had used the library the day before their school was visited, and, if so, to report what use they

¹A paper prepared for delivery before the North Central Association in March, 1933.—THE EDITOR.

²B. Lamar Johnson, *The Secondary-School Library*. U.S. Office of Education Bulletin, 1932, No. 17. National Survey of Secondary Education, Monograph No. 17. Washington: Government Printing Office.

had made of the library. In 14 schools checking lists were filled out by *all* pupils present on the day the school was visited; in the remaining 10 schools care was taken that no selective factor entered into the selection of the pupils.

The data gathered in these schools throw an interesting light on the use of the library in schools having the library and study hall separate and in those having library and study hall combined. In schools having the library and study hall combined, 72.9 per cent of the pupils used library materials (not mere presence in the library but actual use of library materials) as compared with 39.7 per cent in the schools, the libraries of which are separate from their study halls. Analysis of the library activities engaged in by pupils indicates that those in schools having library-study halls engage in every type of library activity (including the use of library materials for preparation of assignments, for work on projects, and for pleasure reading) more than do pupils attending schools, the study halls of which are separate.

The data obtained from the checking lists filled in by 17,463 pupils in 24 schools support the contention of proponents of the library-study hall when they claim that requiring pupils to spend vacant periods in the library encourages the use of library materials. This is undoubtedly caused by the fact that the library-study hall arrangement exposes pupils to books, magazines, and newspapers with frequent regularity.

Findings of this investigation indicate that if the library purposes to encourage the use of its materials the combination plan achieves the aim better than separation. Objections to the library-study hall must not, however, be ignored. A number of schools are attempting to remove the basis for objecting to the combination plan. In four schools, for example, teachers are assigned to the library for each period of the school day.

It is the duty of these teachers to care for attendance routine and for any disciplinary problem which may arise, thus leaving the librarian entirely free for professional work. The success of this arrangement in schools using it indicates that the plan has much to recommend its use in schools having library-study halls.

ADMITTING PUPILS TO THE LIBRARY

Largely in the hands of the school principal is the determination of the means by which pupils are admitted to the library. The method of admitting pupils to the library must be considered not only from the viewpoint of accurate pupil accounting and of ease of administration, but also from the viewpoint of its influence on the use of the library. If pupils have difficulty in gaining admittance to the library, its use will be reduced; if, on the other hand, pupils have ready access to the library, they will be encouraged to come to the library and to use its resources. Among methods of admitting pupils to the libraries in the schools studied are the following:

1. The method of admitting pupils to the library which is most often used, consists of having the pupil get an admission slip from his study-hall teacher and present it to the librarian. This procedure makes it possible to have accurate records of pupils who are not in study halls; but reports from a number of schools indicate that the filling out and signing of attendance slips is a time-consuming activity for pupils, teachers, and librarians.

2. In 48 schools pupils go directly to the library without obtaining permission from anyone; attendance is checked by study-hall teachers or librarians. At the Princeton, New Jersey, High School, where this method is used, the study-hall teacher takes attendance in the study hall. She then brings to the library the names of the pupils who are absent from the study hall and checks off those who are in the library. This method is reported to work satisfactorily: pupils have ready access to the library; the librarian is not burdened with a large amount of attendance routine; and the study-hall teachers find the system less burdensome than that which requires them to sign a slip for each pupil who wishes to go to the library.

3. Pupils in 39 schools go directly to the library and sign their names there. At Girls' High School, Brooklyn, the pupils in the library sign their names on sheets of paper which pupil assistants pass to each table about the middle of every period. During the two or three minutes required to sign these sheets each pupil remains seated, so that there will be no confusion. This method gives pupils ready access to the library and places but little burden upon librarian or teacher.

4. In six schools pupils may go to the library without asking permission as soon as attendance in the study hall has been taken. Schools using this method report that it places a burden upon neither pupils nor staff members.

5. Five schools report that pupils may go to the library without restrictions; attendance is checked neither in the library nor in the study hall. This system gives the pupil most ready access to the library. The chief problem which might arise in the use of this method is that which results from the freedom given the pupils. Three schools which permit their pupils to have this freedom were visited during the survey. In each of these schools, principal and librarian united in stating that pupils have "cut" the library and the study hall no more frequently since the introduction of this system than before.

THE LIBRARY AND NEW METHODS OF CLASSROOM TEACHING

In many schools progressive teachers have been unable to use methods which seem desirable to them because principal, librarian, and teachers have been unable to devise plans whereby library books may be placed at the disposal of pupils during class periods. Administrators who have had such experience will be interested in the section of *The Secondary School Library* that discusses the library and new methods of classroom teaching. This chapter of the bulletin lists and discusses plans which schools report to be using successfully in giving students access to books during class periods. Among the plans most frequently used are classroom libraries, having individual pupils or groups of pupils leave the classroom to go to the library, and having entire classes spend periods in the library.

At the R. J. Reynolds High School,

Winston-Salem, North Carolina, where a modified form of the contract method is used, the library loans books to the classrooms for a day or for part of a day. Teachers notify the library at least a day ahead of time of the books they will need in their classrooms. The librarian groups the books requested, and pupils from the classes needing the books take the books to the classroom and at the close of the period return them to the library.

In eleven schools cooperating in the investigation pupils leave classes and come to the library. Frequently these pupils work on group projects, and if the library has conference rooms the groups use them for their class work.

At the Jackson, Michigan, High School, a library classroom connects directly with the library. Any teacher who wishes to conduct supervised study may bring his class to this classroom, where such books as are needed will be brought for the period.

A group of department libraries has been organized at the J. E. Brown Junior High School, Atlanta, Georgia. Classes desiring to use books during class periods are scheduled on a rotating basis, each class meeting in the departmental library from one to three times a week. Teachers conduct supervised study on the days their classes use the departmental libraries.

MEASURES OF EFFECTIVE LIBRARY SERVICE

Usually school libraries are judged by the number of books they contain, the number of magazines for which they subscribe, the number of pupils they can accommodate at one time, and the number of rooms in the library suite. The bulletin presents data regarding such library facilities (including library rooms, seating capacity, equipment, books and magazines) in the selected schools which cooperated in the investigation. Admin-

istrators may find it helpful to refer to the chapter on facilities of the library in order that they may compare the libraries in their school with those in the schools included in this survey.

Important as standards dealing with library facilities may be, they can scarcely be regarded as measures of effective library service. An entirely different approach to the problem of evaluating library service is that of attempting to determine how much the library and its materials are used. Data on circulation and on library attendance are frequently kept for the purpose of noting changes in the use of the library from day to day, from month to month, and from year to year. Since there is, in high school libraries, a notable lack of standardization in keeping circulation statistics, the use of such data in interpreting the library service of various schools can scarcely be justified.

A second means of interpreting the use made of the school library consists of having pupils fill in checking lists on which they indicate whether on a given day they have used the library, and if so, in what library activities they have engaged on that day. Because gathering and tabulating such information are time consuming, this procedure can scarcely be used regularly in school libraries. It may, however, be used from time to time for the purpose of obtaining data to supplement circulation statistics.

This checking list method was used during visits to 24 of the selected schools which cooperated in the survey. As has been stated, library materials were used by 72.9 per cent of the pupils in schools having library-study halls and by 39.7 per cent of those in schools having library and study hall separate. These data and additional data derived from the checking list method in the survey are not to be regarded as presenting ideal situations with respect to library usage; the figures merely represent the use of library

materials on one day in schools visited during the survey. Since, however, the secondary schools included in the investigation were selected as having superior library service, the libraries in these schools are undoubtedly used more than are those in schools having typical libraries. High school principals who are interested in evaluating library service in their schools should find it interesting to use the checking-list method for studying the use of library materials in their schools as compared with such use in schools cooperating in the survey.

VARIED PRACTICES REPORTED

Since an important purpose of the survey was to list and describe activities and devices used in outstanding secondary-school libraries, the school administrator should profit from an examination of the bulletin with a view to discovering activities being used successfully in other schools. Such an examination should prove helpful to the principal in interpreting the work of the library in his school and in offering suggestions to his librarian.

Among practices reported which may be of interest to the principal are the following:

1. Varied devices for encouraging recreational reading, for interesting teachers in the library, and for encouraging the effective use of library materials.
2. Plans for instructing pupils in the use of the library.
3. Activities of pupil library assistants.
4. Activities of teachers in encouraging the effective use of library materials.

During the survey, the comment was frequently made by school librarians that their principals were not acquainted with the work of their libraries. It is to be hoped that the present investigation may help acquaint administrators with practices in outstanding secondary-school libraries and that it may lead administrators to become more familiar with the libraries in their schools.

INDIVIDUAL DIFFERENCES¹

ROY O. BILLETT

Illinois Normal University

THE United States Office of Education has issued, as a part of the report of the National Survey of Secondary Education, a monograph of some 450 pages entitled *Provisions for Individual Differences, Marking, and Promotion*. Anticipating the appearance of the monograph several partial reports² have been made setting forth certain aspects of the techniques and findings. The present article is an effort, first, to give the reader some notion of the findings which the Survey has made available in the field of individual differences, and second, to set forth briefly a point of view concerning the conditions under which the results of the Survey may be expected to have practical application. Nothing resembling a complete summary of the findings is being attempted. Such a summary is more nearly approximate in the aforementioned partial reports than in the

present article which is intended to deal only with such allusions to the findings as may serve to give one who has not seen the monograph some idea of its contents and hence of its possible usefulness in a specific situation.

The Survey has shown that all provisions for individual differences now in use in outstanding secondary schools are logically assignable to one or another of seven categories; namely, (1) advisory or guidance programs, (2) out-of-school projects or studies, (3) variation in pupil load, (4) scientific study of problem cases, (5) plans characterized by the unit assignment, (6) special classes, and (7) homogeneous grouping. Under these headings may be allocated the elements from which programs have been fashioned which have transformed education in certain communities from monotonous lock-step, leveling processes of mass instruction into diversified educational procedures adapted to the individual pupil. Under these headings the nature of the findings of the Survey will be briefly discussed in the ensuing paragraphs.

NATURE OF THE FINDINGS

Advisory and guidance programs.—The monograph cited in the opening paragraph of this paper shows (Chapter I, Part III) the extent to which exploratory courses for educational and vocational guidance, and advisory programs are maintained in schools of different geographical areas, sizes, and types of organization. These data, however, represent only a small portion of the facts concerning guidance made available by the Survey. Professor Reavis, who

¹A paper prepared for delivery before the North Central Association in March, 1933.—THE EDITOR.

²"What the High Schools Are Doing for the Individual," *School Life*, XVI (January, 1931), 85-87; "What the High Schools Are Doing for the Individual—Second Progress Report," *Proceedings, Department of Secondary-School Principals*, Sixteenth Annual meeting, Bulletin No. 40 (March, 1932), pp. 139-61; "Plans Characterized by the Unit Assignment," *School Review*, XL (November, 1932), 653-68; "The Grouping Idea," *School Life*, XVIII (November, 1932), 43, 44, 56, 57; "Marking and Promotion in Secondary Schools—Some Findings of the National Survey," *Proceedings, Illinois Secondary School Principals' Association*, November, 1932, and *Proceedings Annual Schoolmen's Week*, University of Pennsylvania, March, 1933; "Directed Learning and the Unit Assignment," *Proceedings, Department of Secondary-School Principals*, Seventeenth Annual Meeting, Bulletin No. 45 (March, 1932), pp. 55-76; "Planning a Program to Provide for Individual Differences," *Proceedings, Annual Schoolman's Week*, University of Pennsylvania, 1933.

conducted the Survey's chief study of guidance, has made a report¹ in which he has classified guidance programs into five types; namely, (1) programs carried on through regular administrative officers in individual schools, (2) programs carried on in individual schools by home-room advisers, (3) programs carried on by special counselors in individual schools, (4) programs carried on in school systems and individual schools under the direction and supervision of guidance bureaus or departments, and (5) composite programs. These various types of programs are described in detail in Monograph No. 14 of the National Survey.

The problems involved in a satisfactory guidance program are analogous in important respects to the problems involved in the scientific study of problem cases to be mentioned later. That is, accurate and detailed data must be available for each pupil; and much depends first, on the intelligence with which the data are interpreted and second, on whether the resources of the school afford the pupil the opportunities which interpretation of the data indicates he needs.

Out-of-school projects or studies.—The monograph on individual differences (Chapter II, Part III) reports the extent to which credit for out-of-school projects or studies is granted in schools of different geographical areas, sizes, and types of organization. The fields of activity wherein such credit may be earned, are also shown.

Variation in pupil load.—Providing for individual differences through variation in the number of subjects which pupils may carry necessarily leads to the retardation of those pupils carrying less than the normal number of subjects, and

to the acceleration of those pupils carrying more than the normal number of subjects provided each pupil receives credit for the work which he does. Since credits are now determined largely in terms of units of time, any attempt to vary pupil load must reckon with the requirements and standards of State departments of education and of other accrediting agencies. A considerable number of schools report the procedure in use as a provision for individual differences. These schools are classified (Chapter I, Part III) according to geographical location, size, and type of organization. The data show the frequencies with which different members of the school staff are entrusted with the duty of determining the number of subjects each pupil should carry, and the items of information likely to influence the official's decision concerning the optimum load for each pupil. The practices in certain individual schools are described in adequate detail.

Scientific study of problem cases.—A few secondary schools provide systematic procedures meriting classification under the caption "the scientific study of problem cases." In most schools trained personnel for this type of provision for individual differences is usually lacking or inadequate. The monograph (Chapter I, Part III) discusses the personnel in charge of the study of problem cases. Procedures are described whereby the pupil is recommended for observation, case study, and diagnosis. Symptoms, difficulties, offenses, and handicaps cited as reasons for recommending pupils for study as problem cases, are reported and classified. The nature of the preliminary inquiry to discover as quickly as possible the source of the pupil's difficulty, is detailed. An exhaustive list of data collected when complete case studies are needed is reported and the items are classified under the following heads: (1) census data, (2) medical and physical

¹William C. Reavis, "Guidance Programs in Secondary Schools," *Proceedings, Department of Secondary-School Principals, Sixteenth Annual Meeting, Bulletin, No. 40* (March, 1932), pp. 67-81.

examination data, (3) school history, (4) recreational and leisure activities, (5) pupil's associates, (6) facts concerning the immediate family, (7) other facts concerning family, home, and neighborhood, and (8) pupil's plans for the future. The nature of remedial treatment is outlined and illustrations are given from individual schools.

Plans characterized by the unit assignment.—Education has not been noted for the clarity of its terminology and in no field has the terminology become more confused than in the field of plans characterized by the unit assignment. The evolution of this terminology is set forth in the Survey report in an effort to bring some semblance of order out of the existing chaos (Chapter I, Part II). The terms investigated are those frequently used in connection with the contract plan, Dalton plan, individualized instruction, laboratory plan, Morrison plan, problem method, project method, unit assignment, differentiated assignments, and the Winnetka technique.

Four comparative studies were made to discover just what practices of secondary schools are included under the aforementioned terms. Separate studies were made of the Morrison plan, Dalton plan, and Winnetka technique. In each study the actual practices of a highly selected group of schools were compared point-for-point with certain fundamental features of the plan or technique as set forth by its originator. With the remaining procedures a different method was used. Since each of these procedures springs from diverse sources, no authoritative external criteria with which to compare practices were available. Therefore a systematic intercomparison was made of the practices of selected schools classified according to their preferences for one or more of the seven terms.

One by-product of these studies, of value to the practical schoolman is the

summarization in brief space of the differentiae which theoretically distinguish the Morrison plan, the Dalton plan and the Winnetka technique from other teaching procedures, characterized by the use of the unit assignment. In the case of the Morrison plan, (Chapter II, Part II) differentiae center around (1) Morrison's concept of the unit, (2) his recognition of five types of subject matter, and hence of five types of teaching and learning situations, and (3) his emphasis on the five teaching steps. For the Dalton plan the criteria for comparison are summarized (Chapter III, Part II) under seven heads; namely, (1) extent of the plan within the school, (2) the "house," (3) the "laboratory," (4) the "bulletin board," (5) the daily time schedule, (6) the assignment, and (7) pupil progress. The practices in Winnetka are summarized (Chapter IV, Part II) under six heads, as follows: (1) the reorganization of the traditional curriculum into (a) knowledges and skills subjects, and (b) group, socialized, self-expressive, or creative activities; (2) the nature and manner of presentation of the knowledges and skills subjects; (3) the nature and manner of presentation of the group, socialized, self-expressive, or creative activities; (4) degree of correlation between the two phases of the curriculum; (5) classification of pupils as self-reliant and supervised, and (6) homogeneous grouping on the basis of social age.

The comparative extents are shown to which plans characterized by the unit assignment are in use in schools of different geographical areas, sizes, and types of organization (Chapter IV, Part II). The terminology of the entire field is reviewed and a greatly simplified terminology is suggested. The terms "unit" and "unit assignment" are set forth as the comprehensive terms in the field. The unit and the unit assignment

are described in terms of actual practice. Each term is given what is believed to be a logical definition and a clear distinction between the two terms is suggested.

Detailed description is given of the many problems involved in building unit assignments, including the difficulties presented by questions of time allotments; differentiated assignments; choice of topics, references, and problems within the assignment for a given level; revision; and correlation.

Phases of the teaching and learning cycle adapted to the use of the unit assignment are described. The purposes of each phase, the methods employed in each phase, and time allotment of each phase are reported.

The unit assignment is further studied in relation to the following items: (1) self-corrective practice material, (2) pupils' progress records, (3) marking system, (4) reports to parents, (5) retardation, acceleration, and promotion, (6) length of school days, (7) classroom and office equipment, (8) home study, (9) supervised and self-reliant pupils, and (10) motivation.

Although the typical unit assignment now in use is recognized as having a unique value in any plan to provide for individual differences, its potentialities will not be fully realized until certain questions have received better answers than have been given them so far anywhere. These questions follow.

1. What do the subject-matter specialists regard as the real contributions which study of their subject matter may make to the growth of the individual? How may these contributions be classified under the headings of concepts, attitudes, appreciations, knowledges, and skills?

2. How are these concepts, attitudes, appreciations, knowledges, and skills ranked by capable adults who are not subject-matter specialists, from the standpoint of their importance; their range of use; the difficulty of acquiring them; the desirability of acquiring them in certain subject-matter fields rather than

in others, or even entirely outside the school?

3. To what extent may principles of differentiation and adaptation of subject matter be obtained from the analysis and interpretation: of psychological studies reported in educational literature; of studies of children's present needs and immediate interests, to be made through interviews with the children themselves, and through observation of their present normal activities; and of studies of probable adult needs?

4. Do these studies suggest a certain organization and sequence of subject matter which will be most consistent with the pupil's normal processes of growth?

5. What minimum essentials should be required of all pupils, and to what extent is it necessary to retard the progress of the slower pupils in order that thorough mastery may be assured?

6. What should be the content and method of honors courses in each grade for the very capable or gifted; of courses for the superior but not gifted; and of courses for the normal pupil?

7. How can tests be developed the passing of which will constitute entirely adequate grounds for excusing pupils from certain phases of a course or even from certain courses?

8. How can the work of all subject-matter fields be correlated and integrated?

9. How can the products of learning be adequately and economically measured?

These questions should become real service problems to practical schoolmen as well as challenging research problems to those engaged in educational research.

An entire chapter (Chapter VI, Part II) is given over to a presentation of specimen unit assignments submitted to the Survey staff to illustrate techniques now in use. The chapter can have little value as a source of ready-made units and unit assignments. It may prove valuable as a source of ideas and techniques.

Special classes.—The Survey has shown that in practice special classes begin where homogeneous grouping leaves off. That is, homogeneous grouping usually provides for three ability levels, namely, those who are normal, those somewhat below normal, and those somewhat above normal. Special classes are

then formed for the remaining pupils who deviate so extremely from the normal that further provision should be made for them. Such pupils may deviate in capacities or in needs or in both. On the one hand they are the very slow or the very capable, on the other hand they are pupils of any capacity who for the time being need special help in overcoming handicaps due perhaps to illness, absence, lack of industry, or deficiencies in the prerequisites of certain courses. In the report on provisions for individual differences special classes are discussed from many points of view such as: (1) types of special classes in use, (2) reasons for establishing them, (3) kinds of pupils assigned to special classes, (4) factors considered in the assignment of pupils to special classes, (5) methods of determining a pupil's eligibility for assignment, (6) intervals at which pupils are assigned or removed, (7) subjects in which help is given, (8) extent to which the plan is operative in the several secondary grades, (9) when and where special classes meet, (10) the curriculum in special classes, (11) teaching procedure in special classes, (12) essential qualifications of teachers for different kinds of special classes, and (13) reactions of pupils, parents, teachers, and administrators to special classes. Numerous illustrations are given of different kinds of special classes in individual schools.

Homogeneous grouping.—In the course of the Survey it has become obvious that many practical schoolmen have failed to make the most of homogeneous grouping as a provision for individual differences because their enthusiasm for the procedure has been dimmed by (1) charges from various sources that the procedure is undemocratic, (2) misinterpretation of the significance of the fact that complete homogeneity is unattainable, and (3) uncertainty as to the types of pupils for

which, and types of educative situations in which homogeneous grouping is most valuable. The Survey has not settled these questions but does set forth important points of view concerning them (Chapter I, Part I).

An overview is given of the practice of homogeneous grouping in the secondary schools of the United States classified according to geographical location, size, and type of organization (Chapter II, Part I). Grouping *within* the class section as well as *into* class sections, is discussed.

Answers to the following questions have been made available (Chapter III, Part I) in terms of the practice of 289 schools selected as outstanding in the use of homogeneous grouping. Needless to say the answers to these questions have important implications for any program to provide for individual differences.

1. What percentage of the total offerings in all grades and subject-matter fields are presented to pupils segregated into homogeneous groups?
2. What effect has grade placement of offerings on the percentage of classes segregated into homogeneous groups?
3. What variations occur in percentages of classes segregated into homogeneous groups in (a) academic, commercial, and other non-academic fields, (b) various individual subject-matter fields, and (c) various individual subjects?
4. What further variations are observed in 3 (a), (b), and (c) when the schools are classified according to (a) total enrollment, (b) type of organization, and (c) seventh-, ninth-, and twelfth-grade enrollments?
5. What is the relation of grade placement of subjects in the various subject-matter fields, to the number of homogeneous levels provided?
6. What is the relation of seventh-, ninth-, and twelfth-grade enrollment to the number of homogeneous levels provided?

Another series of questions answered in Chapter V, Part I, will be of interest to practical schoolmen. They follow.

1. How is each pupil's classification level determined?

2. To what extent is class size varied for the different homogeneous levels?
3. How are class sections formed?
4. What is the practice with respect to transferring pupils from one classification level to another?
5. How often are all pupils reorganized into new homogeneous groups?
6. To what extent are courses and curriculums modified for the different levels?
7. To what extent is teaching procedure modified for the different levels?

Sixteen different bases of grouping were studied (Chapter IV, Part I) from the standpoints of (1) use in each subject and subject-matter field, and (2) use in schools of different (a) geographical areas, (b) sizes, and (c) types of organization. These bases are:

1. Group intelligence-test score or mental age.
2. Intelligence quotient from a group mental test.
3. Average scholarship marks in all subjects combined.
4. Average scholarship marks in this or related subjects.
5. Educational- or achievement-test age or score.
6. Educational or achievement quotient.
7. Teacher's rating of pupil's academic ability or intelligence.
8. Average of several teachers' ratings of pupil's academic ability or intelligence.
9. Individual intelligence-test score or mental age.
10. Intelligence quotient from individual test.
11. Health.
12. Industry, application, or effort.
13. Social maturity.
14. Physical maturity.
15. Type of home environment.
16. Score from a prognostic test.

A chapter (Chapter VI, Part I) is given over to a summarization of significant practices in individual schools and school systems. These illustrative materials deal with (1) bases of grouping, (2) collection and organization of data for grouping, (3) use of the data in classifying pupils, (4) misplacement of pupils, (5) transfer of pupils from one level to another, (6) differentiated

content, (7) differentiated teaching procedure, (8) homogeneous grouping and special classes, and (9) miscellaneous features. Each illustration has been chosen to exemplify some particular feature of homogeneous grouping in current practice.

PRACTICAL APPLICATION OF THE FINDINGS

Rules and panaceas.—From the preceding paragraphs perhaps the reader has received some notion of the nature of the findings of the Survey in the field of provisions for individual differences. How can the findings be given practical application? In the writer's opinion three factors are involved in the practical application of the results of any investigation: first, the results themselves; second, a specific situation in which they are to be applied; and third, an intelligence thoroughly informed not only concerning the results and the specific situation in which they are to be used, but also aware of the probable consequences of the introduction of the new elements. Since no two specific situations are exactly alike, one may reasonably expect a number of equally practical applications of any finding of the Survey. In the writer's opinion, no rules should be formulated and no panaceas prescribed. Schools vary in size, in type of organization, in racial, ethnic, social and economic groups served, and in the degree of financial support locally accorded to education. An integrated program of provisions for individual differences adapted to a specific school and community must be the product of thoughtful planning and experimentation with the local situation in mind.

The small school.—It is significant that one or more modifications of each of the seven types of provisions for individual differences in use in outstanding secondary schools may be employed in

schools of any type or size. In general small schools make less adequate provisions for individual differences than large schools not because any of the seven types of provisions for individual differences intrinsically are better adapted to schools of any particular size, but rather for reasons which are fundamentally economic. On the one hand the small school usually lacks, and under prevailing conditions can not afford, the variety of differentiated courses and curriculums which must accompany thoroughgoing efforts to meet individual needs. On the other hand the small school is unable to employ the specially trained personnel whose services are essential to the proper functioning of a program to provide for individual differences.

Undoubtedly more could be done in many of these small schools than is being done. Apparently after consolidation has advanced as far as local conditions justify, the handicap of a restricted curriculum could be lessened further through (1) state-controlled correspondence courses, and (2) cooperative endeavors with neighboring small schools resulting in the joint employment of specialists in each of the several subject-matter fields, the time of each specialist being apportioned among the cooperating schools. Furthermore, the lack of other specially trained personnel might be remedied in a similar way. For example, a group of cooperating small schools often could afford to employ jointly such specialists as school physicians, school nurses, visiting teachers, counselors, consulting psychologists, curriculum specialists, or

specialists in research and measurement, thus removing one of the chief obstacles encountered in the small school in the development of an efficient program to provide for individual differences.

Improving the local program.—Regardless of the size of the school system involved, those who would use the results of the Survey in an effort to improve the local program to provide for individual differences are not likely to find a safe substitute for an intensive first-hand study of the published report. Hence, at this time it seems wise to offer only the following general and rather obvious suggestions for the use of the findings of the Survey in a local community. First, determine the extent to which each category of practice mentioned above is represented by various elements in the local program to provide for individual differences. Second, examine carefully the report of the National Survey to discover the extent to which each category is represented in the practices of outstanding secondary schools. Third, make comparisons. In most instances the introduction of new practices and the modification or elimination of old practices will be indicated. It is not within the province of the Survey staff to make these necessary comparisons and decisions. The work of the Survey is finished. Educators in service, charged with the responsibility for planning educational programs, must decide what use shall be made of the findings. Through the intelligence and efforts of these educators the results of the Survey will find practical application in thousands of schools for years to come.

ACADEMIC MAJORS AND MINORS

CALVIN O. DAVIS
University of Michigan

THE North Central Association declares that all teachers of academic subjects in accredited high schools "must teach only in those fields in which they have made adequate preparation."¹ The Association then states that fifteen semester hours of collegiate work taken within a single department of learning will be recognized as the minimum number of hours required to satisfy this standard. It is well known, however, that fifteen semester hours are considerably below the number of hours required for a major in most of our colleges and universities and are indeed fewer than the number required for a minor in some institutions.

In order to discover the actual practices in vogue in respect to majors and minors in typical institutions of learning, a study was recently made by the writer covering 31 universities and colleges in the North Central Association territory. Every teacher training institution authorized to train secondary school teachers in the State of Michigan was canvassed and likewise 10 of the Schools of Education connected with some of the large universities of the territory. The lists of institutions follow.

A. MICHIGAN COLLEGES (excluding the University)

I. *Public Institutions*

State College of Agriculture and Mechanical Arts, Lansing
College of the City of Detroit, Detroit
City Teachers College, Detroit
Central State Teachers College, Mt. Pleasant
Michigan State Normal College, Ypsilanti
Northern State Teachers College, Marquette
Western State Teachers College, Kalamazoo

II. *Non-Public Institutions*

Adrian College, Adrian

Albion College, Albion
Alma College, Alma
Battle Creek College, Battle Creek
Calvin College, Grand Rapids
Emanuel College, Berrien Springs
Hillsdale College, Hillsdale
Hope College, Holland
Kalamazoo College, Kalamazoo
Marygrove College, Detroit
Nazareth College, Nazareth
Olivet College, Olivet
St. Joseph's College, Adrian
University of Detroit, Detroit

B. SCHOOLS OR COLLEGES OF EDUCATION (in large universities)

University of Chicago, Chicago
University of Illinois, Urbana
University of Indiana, Bloomington
University of Iowa, Iowa City
University of Kansas, Lawrence
University of Michigan, Ann Arbor
University of Minnesota, Minneapolis
University of Missouri, Columbia
Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois
Ohio State University, Columbus
University of Wisconsin, Madison

Table I gives the summaries of replies made by the 31 institutions to a set of 13 definite questions relating to the administration of majors and minors. An analysis of the table shows the following interesting facts:

All but five of the 31 institutions canvassed require both an academic major and an academic minor of all candidates preparing for teaching positions in secondary schools. The exceptions are Iowa and four colleges in Michigan. Likewise all but three of the 31 institutions declare that there is approximate uniformity respecting the number of hours that comprise these several subject matter majors and minors. This latter claim is, however, not fully borne out by a careful analysis of the facts. Either the word

¹STANDARD 7C.

"approximate" was construed broadly or else the writers in some cases meant to imply that there is generally a common *minimum* number of hours set for most subjects but that particular departments may add to these requirements.

Some few institutions have different regulations for majors from what they do for minors. Thus, for example, Wisconsin states that the institution has no uniform requirements for majors but does have for minors.

TABLE I

SUMMARIES OF REPLIES TO 16 QUESTIONS OF POLICY APPEARING ON THE QUESTIONNAIRE SENT OUT

QUESTION	MICHIGAN COLLEGES		SCHOOLS OF EDUCATION		TOTAL	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
1. Do you require both an academic major and an academic minor for prospective teachers of academic subjects in high schools?	17	4	9	1	26	5
2. Is there approximate uniformity respecting the number of hours that comprise respectively these several subject matter majors and minors?	20	1	9	1	28	3
3. Are the majors and minors definitely outlined in each subject matter field so that most of the courses that comprise them are fixed and prescribed? .	17	4	4	6	21	10
4. Are the particular sets of major and minor requirements the same for prospective teachers of junior high schools as for senior high schools?	18	3	10	0	28	3
5. Do you under certain circumstances require one or two academic majors but no academic minors?	6	15	1	9	7	24
6. Do you ever permit a candidate to offer two or more academic minors in lieu of an academic major and an academic minor?	2	19	3	7	5	26
7. Do you have so-called <i>teaching</i> or <i>group</i> majors and minors as distinguished from strictly departmental majors and minors?	5	16	7	3	12	19
8. In the English major or minor is the usual required freshman course in Rhetoric required?	7	14	4	6	11	20
9. Do you permit special methods courses in Education (e.g., The Teaching of English, or The Teaching of Algebra) to be counted toward certain academic majors and minors?	11	10	4	6	15	16
10. Are any of the other courses in Education permitted to be counted in certain academic majors and minors? ..	4	17	0	10	4	27
11. Is work done in the high school course counted toward the college academic major or minor?	0	21	0	10	0	31
12. Are Science and Mathematics together ever counted toward a major or minor?	9	12	4	6	13	18
13. Do you provide a separate and distinct training curriculum for junior high school teachers?	1	20	0	10	1	30

To the question, "Are the majors and minors definitely outlined in each subject matter field so that most of the courses that comprise them are fixed and prescribed," 21 of the 31 institutions replying say "Yes," 10 say "No." It is to be noted, that relatively speaking the schools of education are much less likely to follow this practice than are the independent colleges. Of the Michigan group the only ones not doing this generally are Adrian, Hillsdale, St. Joseph's, and the University of Detroit. And yet some others tend to qualify their affirmative answers a bit. For example, Detroit Teachers College adds, "in many fields"; Michigan State College says, "Fairly so"; Olivet qualifies its answer *Yes* by the words, "Some variations." While the Michigan State Teachers College writes: "Yes, within certain limits. However two students may major in history, for example, and only a part of the course may be common."

Much of the same situation obtains among schools of education. For example, in the University of Michigan the majors and minors are, for the most part, rather definitely outlined, and yet there is considerable variation to be found in the different fields of work. Students majoring or minoring in the same subject do not necessarily have precisely the same courses, but find many options open to them.

What is true at the University of Michigan is true in the Universities of Chicago, Iowa, Kansas, and probably some of the others that did not specifically mention the facts. In Kansas the Liberal Arts College controls the A.B. degree and the courses making up the majors and minors therein are somewhat narrowly prescribed; the School of Education however controls the B.S. degree (in Education) and for this considerable freedom in course elections is allowed.

TRAINING JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS

Apparently few institutions of any kind are making especial provisions for the training of junior high school teachers. Possibly the theory holds that their training should be no different from the training given senior high school teachers; possibly it means that no particular thought has been given to the matter and tradition continues to operate unchallenged. At any rate 28 of the 31 institutions canvassed declare that the particular sets of majors and minors are the same for both groups of candidates. This means that only three institutions make distinctions, and these are located in Michigan—Olivet, Northern State Teachers College, and Western State Teachers College. Even among these three colleges there is some equivocation. Thus Olivet replied, somewhat indefinitely, "Yes, but there is some variation"; Northern State Teachers College wrote: "Majors and minors are the same for junior and senior high schools except in the number of hours. A junior high school major is $18\frac{2}{3}$ semester hours, a senior high school major is 24 hours. A junior high school minor is $10\frac{2}{3}$ semester hours; a senior high school minor is 16 semester hours." Western State Teachers College merely wrote, "No, the majors and minors may differ, and often will."

Question five read, "Do you under certain circumstances require one or two academic majors but no academic minors?" Only seven of the 31 institutions declare this ever to be their policy. Six of these are in Michigan and one is a School of Education outside of Michigan. The Michigan colleges comprise Adrian, Albion, Calvin, Detroit Teachers College, Hope, and the Michigan State Normal College. The out-of-state institution is Northwestern. Michigan State College

wrote, "We recommend the practice but do not require it."

Question number six was nearly the counterpart of question five. It read, "Do you ever permit a candidate to offer two or more academic minors in lieu of an academic major and an academic minor?" The score here is 5 for and 26 against the practice. The ones permitting the plan are: Battle Creek ("rarely"), Detroit Teachers College, the University of Michigan, Northwestern, and Wisconsin. The University of Michigan not only permits the practice but advises it for all prospective junior high school teachers. At Wisconsin two minors in strictly academic subjects are acceptable when the major is Education.

GROUP MAJORS AND MINORS

To the question inquiring about group or teaching majors and minors as distinguished from departmental majors and minors, 5 of the Colleges and 7 of the University Schools of Education claim to have one or more such arrangements. A later table gives the details of these policies. Apparently there is a decided trend toward this arrangement in our Schools of Education, but not as yet much attention given to it in the independent colleges. For example, Wisconsin writes, "We are working on two—General Science and the Social Studies." Minnesota has just completed such arrangements for Natural Science. Iowa, Missouri and Ohio likewise have group majors in two or more fields of interest, while at the University of Michigan there are group majors in English, Social Studies, General Science, Physical Science, and Biological Science. The required number of hours in these groups at Michigan runs from 32 to 38. In some of these divisions there are also group minors. At Michigan a group major in English comprises 24 hours in English and American Literature, 3 to 9 hours in

English Language, and 6 to 12 hours in composition, rhetoric and criticism, making a total of 35 hours. A major in General Science comprises 32 hours distributed over six fields, namely Botany, Zoology, Physics, Chemistry, Astronomy, and Geology. Forestry is also recommended. A major in the Social Studies comprises: History distributed over three fields (with one course specifically in American history), 20 hours; Geography, 6 hours; Political Science, 6 hours; and Economics and Sociology, 3 hours each. This gives a total of 38 hours. A minor in the Social Studies consists of 28 hours.

The independent colleges that have group majors in one or more fields are Adrian, Battle Creek, Emanuel, and the Northern and the Western State Teachers Colleges. The Detroit Teachers College and the Detroit City College state that, while no such groupings are officially set up, students, "through their elections," virtually have them. This, however, is probably true of all other colleges and ought not to be considered on quite the same basis.

Question 8 sought to discover if Freshman English is ordinarily counted in computing hours for an English major or minor. Eleven institutions say that it is; 20 say that it is not. However, unless one knows the minimum number of hours required respectively for an English major and an English minor this information has little significance. For, clearly, an institution that requires 30 hours *with* Freshman English is in precisely the same category as one that requires 24 hours *omitting* Freshman English. Nevertheless the data given are interesting because of the fact that relatively so many more Schools of Education profess to include the first year's work than do the independent colleges. And yet one may wonder why this should be so.

Question 9 asked whether special meth-

ods courses in Education are counted towards academic majors and minors. Fifteen of the 31 institutions replying say they are, although only four of the ten Schools of Education make this a practice, and two of these add the words, "In rare cases." Here again, as in the case of English, the special course in question appears to be quite generally required of all students. Whether, however, the credit is carried to Education or to the academic subject seems to be a matter of bookkeeping. Nevertheless, from the data at hand, there is no way of knowing whether the credit if allotted to the major or minor subject, is an extra or not.

Question 10 extended the inquiry of number nine and inquired whether any other courses in Education other than methods courses are ever counted in making up academic majors and minors. Only four institutions of the entire number seem to do so, and one of these specifically lists Psychology as being the one course included. It is probable that this is the case with the other three institutions, since the State Department of Michigan regularly classifies the subject as Education although the University of Michigan does not. Not one of the Schools of Education reporting counts either this subject or any course in Education (other than methods) as part of an academic major or minor.

According to the replies returned to question eleven not a single institution of the entire 31 counts high school work in making up academic majors and minors. However, the question itself was not as specific as it should have been. No institution probably gives college credit for high school work as such (unless this is post graduate work.) On the other hand most institutions base majors and minors in foreign languages upon the high school credits gained in them. Thus, at the University of Michigan a major

in French is 37 hours *if* the candidate begins his French in college; if he has had two years of French in high school the number of hours is only twenty-nine. Like conditions obtain in respect to Latin, Spanish and German. In other words, it seems to be fairly common practice among departments of foreign language to demand from 8 to 16 hours more for a major or a minor, if the candidate begins the work in college.

Question 12 read, "Are science and mathematics together ever counted toward a major or minor?" Thirteen of the 31 institutions reporting say that such is the case. In almost every instance where the practice is found at all it concerns mathematics and physics only, but in a few cases it is mathematics and science in general. This latter plan appears to be particularly true where the idea of concentration is in vogue. The Schools of Education that combine mathematics and science into majors are Chicago, Iowa, Kansas, and Ohio.

Question 13 read, "Does your institution provide a separate and distinct training curriculum for junior high school teachers?" To this only one institution replied in the affirmative, the Western State Teachers College, and it adds: "It differs but slightly from that for the senior high school."

The accompanying list shows by what authority the majors and minors are determined. Among the Michigan Colleges this is almost invariably by faculty action on the recommendation of a curriculum committee or by heads of departments. In a few cases it is by conferences of the administrative heads concerned. In most instances, apparently, the faculty determines the number of hours to be required for a major and a minor but the department concerned decides upon the particular courses that shall compose this work.

In Schools of Education a variety of

practices exist. Wherever the School of Education is wholly independent its faculty decides upon the regulations, but usually upon the recommendation of some committee or of the heads of departments within its own school. Where a joint responsibility for the training of teachers exists as at the University of Michigan, University of Chicago, and some other institutions, representatives of the departments in the two schools

concerned make recommendations and the faculty of the School of Education approves. In some cases the A.B. degree and its majors and minors are controlled wholly by the faculty of the Liberal Arts College; the B.S. degree in Education with its majors and minors is controlled by the faculty of the School of Education. This is the case at Kansas, Indiana, and Northwestern, and possibly elsewhere. In general the trend in

AUTHORITY BY WHICH MAJOR AND MINOR REQUIREMENTS ARE DETERMINED

A. MICHIGAN COLLEGES

I. *Public Institutions*

State College
College of City of Detroit
Detroit Teachers College
Central S. T. C.
Michigan S. N. C.
Northern S. T. C.
Western S. T. C.

By faculty action.
By agreement of department heads.
By faculty regulations based on departmental recommendations.
The faculty determines the hours; department heads the courses.
By each department by itself with approval of President.
By State Board of Education.
By curriculum committee in cooperation with departments.

II. *Non-Public Colleges*

Adrian
Albion
Alma
Battle Creek
Calvin
Emanuel
Hillsdale

By faculty action.
By scholarship committee and divisional council.
By curriculum committee and faculty.
By curriculum committee and faculty.
By faculty action.
No reply.
The faculty determines the number of hours; the department chairmen decide upon the courses.
By course committee and faculty.
The faculty determines the number of hours; the departments the courses to be included.
By the administration.
No reply.
By faculty action on recommendation of head of department.
No reply.
By conference of Dean and heads of departments.

Hope
Kalamazoo

Marygrove
Nazareth
Olivet
St. Joseph's
University of Detroit

B. UNIVERSITY SCHOOLS OF EDUCATION

Chicago
Illinois
Indiana
Iowa
Kansas
Michigan
Minnesota
Missouri
Northwestern
Ohio State
Wisconsin

By action of the two Faculties.
No reply.
By head of department concerned.
Departmental recommendation to course of study committee to general L.A. faculty.
Concurrent action of the two faculties for A.B.; action of School of Education alone for B.S.
Recommendation of heads of departments concerned in Literary College and School of Education and by action by School of Education faculty.
No reply.
By major or minor adviser in each field.
Recommendation of Undergraduate Committee and School of Education faculty approval.
Recommendation by Curriculum Committee and approval of the College Faculty.
Recommendation of Committee on Teacher Training and action by School of Education faculty.

these institutions appears to be to give the final authority to the School of Education, but to have the authority exercised in happy cooperation with other interests concerned.

Table II, dealing with the item asking for the maximum number of semester hours allowed for majors and minors, shows facts that have long been thought to exist. There is no uniformity whatever

maximum for a major, although at least 9 of the 31 institutions canvassed permit an excess of this number. From 15 to 20 hours appears to be the norm for minors, although it is apparent from the returns that respondents confused the idea of a *maximum* with the idea of a *minimum* in giving their replies.

Altogether this table is not very satisfactory. In the first place some respondents reported term hours rather than semester hours; in some cases it was difficult, if not impossible, to know which terminology was meant; in some instances teaching majors and minors were confused with departmental majors and minors; and in some cases, as indicated, not maximum but minimum conditions were reported. The chief value of the table is that it shows the desperate need we are in for clarifying our terminology, and possibly for arriving at more uniform standards for judging majors and minors.

Table III supplements Table II and shows in detail the number of semester hours that are required for majors and minors in the various subjects. The questionnaire asked here for facts relating solely to departmental or academic majors and minors, in contradistinction to so-called group or teaching majors and minors. In not every instance, however, was the classification kept clear. Certain it is, though, that few institutions have as yet planned anything but departmental majors and minors, and even where the newer ideal prevails it is found only in reference to a few subjects, like General Science and Social Studies.

The table shows in detail, however, the jumble of policies that operate in our educational institutions. In general a major appears to consist of approximately 25 semester hours; a minor of approximately 15 semester hours. It is, however, difficult to judge the facts

TABLE II
MAXIMUM NUMBER OF SEMESTER HOURS
ALLOWED FOR MAJOR AND MINOR

A. MICHIGAN COLLEGES

I. Public Institutions

	Major	Minor
State College	35	?
College of City of Detroit	45	?
Detroit Teachers College .	40	?
Central S. T. C.	24	16
Michigan S. N. C.	24	21
Northern S. T. C.	24	16
Western S. T. C.	24	16

II. Non-Public Colleges

Adrian	24	?
Albion	40	?
Alma	No limits	20
Battle Creek	40	20
Calvin	No limits	No limits
Emanuel	40	40
Hillsdale	27	No limits
Hope	30	15
Kalamazoo	No limits	—
Marygrove	40	20
Nazareth	40	20
Olivet	No limits	No limits
St. Joseph's	30	18
University of Detroit	32	20

R. UNIVERSITY SCHOOLS
OF EDUCATION

	<i>Not specified</i>	<i>Not specified</i>
Chicago	<i>Not specified</i>	<i>Not specified</i>
Illinois	<i>No limits</i>	<i>No limits</i>
Indiana	40	30
Iowa	40	—
Kansas	40	30
Michigan	40	<i>No limits</i>
Missouri	<i>No limits</i>	<i>no limits</i>
Northwestern	36	20
Ohio State	<i>No limits</i>	<i>No limits</i>
Wisconsin	40	15

among teacher training institutions on the matter. The range is from 24 semester hours to "No limit" for a major, and from 14 semester hours up for a minor. Generally speaking 40 hours is the

about foreign language work, since clearly, in some instances at least, the requirements presuppose an elementary training in these fields in the high school. But how much such preliminary work is expected is not stated. Here again there is great need for some uniformity of practice or else for a plan for basing major and minor requirements on something else than a mere matter of credit hours.

Table IV is concerned with the requirements for the so-called "group" or "teaching" majors and minors. As indicated under the discussions of Tables II and

III few institutions as yet have such arrangements as these and where they are found they are organized within only a few fields of interest. Clearly, though, if the theory of liberal culture for teachers has any great validity, and if the doctrine that specialization should be anchored in a firm foundation of related subjects, more provision for arrangements of these sorts would appear to be desirable.

Some details regarding these group or teaching majors are interesting. Thus California (not, however, included in our tabular data) requires for the group

TABLE
NUMBER OF SEMESTER HOURS REQUIRED FOR DEPARTMENTAL

A. MICHIGAN COLLEGES I. <i>Public Institutions</i>	Eng.		Hist.		Math.		Latin		German		French	
	mj.	mi.	mj.	mi.	mj.	mi.	mj.	mi.	mj.	mi.	mj.	mi.
State College	40+	x	40+	x	40+	x	x	x	46	x	46	x
College of City of Detroit	24	..	28	..	30	28	..	32	..
Detroit Teachers College	28	..	28	..	28	..	28	..	28	..	28	..
Central State T.C.	24	18	24	18	24	18	24	18	24	18	24	18
Michigan State T.C.	24	18	24	18	24	18	24	18	24	18	24	18
Northern State T.C.	24	16	24	16	24	16	24	16	24	16
Western State T.C.	24	18	24	18	24	18	24	18	24	18	24	18
II. <i>Non-Public Institutions</i>												
Adrian	24	x	24	x	24	x	24	x	24	x	24	x
Albion	36	..	24	..	24	..	24	..	24	..	24	..
Alma	24	20	24	20	24	20	24	20	24	20	24	20
Battle Creek	30	14	30	14	25	..	x	x	35†	..	35†	..
Calvin	24	15	24	15	24	15	24	15	24	15	24	15
Emanuel	30	20	30	20	30	20	28	18	28	18
Hillsdale	25	10	25	10	25	10	25	10	25	10	25	10
Hope	30	15	30	15	22	12	24	10	30	10	30	10
Kalamazoo	20	12	20	12	20	12	20	12	20	12	20	12
Marygrove	no replies given to this question											
Nazareth	24	12	24	12	24	12	24	12	24	12	24	12
Olivet	24	18	24	18	24	18	24	18	24	18	24	18
St. Joseph's	no answers given to this question											
University of Detroit	24	18	24	18	26	18	28	18	30	25	30	20
B. SCHOOLS OF EDUCATION IN LARGE UNIVERSITIES												
Chicago†	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20
Illinois§	30	20	30	20	30	20	30	20	30	20	30	20
Indiana	40	..	40	..	40	..	40	..	40	..	40	..
Iowa	30	20	30	20	30	20	30	20	30	20	30	20
Kansas	x	x	25	15	24	14	40	32	34	26	37	28
Minnesota	27	19	30	12	23	18	21	16	24	12	24	12
Missouri 	29	18	40	30	24	15	24	15	24	15	24	15
Northwestern	Not answered											
Ohio State 	27	16	30	16	27	16	30	20	30	20	30	20
Wisconsin	28	18	32	16	21	15	31	19	24	14	28	18

*Biology. †French, German, Spanish. §No departmental major or minor but instead a combined major in science consisting of 36 hours of science and 6 in mathematics. ||Chicago's plan can not be easily translated into the scheme used here. Hence that school is omitted. §A minor in Illinois may be in one or two fields, but if two

major in the Social Studies 18 semester hours of history (including American History), 6 hours in Political Science, 6 hours in Economics, either 6 hours in geography or 8 hours in anthropology, and 12 additional hours taken either in Political Science or Economics. This makes a total of 48 or 50. It must be remembered however that California requires five years of training before a certificate is granted.

A major in Biological Science in California comprises Physiology, 5 hours; Zoology, 4 hours; Bacteriology, 4 hours; Botany, 4 hours; Chemistry, 5 hours;

and 12 additional hours chosen in *each* of the two fields selected from the following: Botany, Zoology, Physiology, and Hygiene. This gives a total of 46 hours.

At the University of Michigan, as was stated before, a group major in English consists of 24 hours in English and American literature, 3 to 9 hours in English language, and 12 to 6 hours in composition, rhetoric and criticism (not counting Freshman English.) General Science as a major in the University of Michigan comprises 32 hours distributed over six fields as follows: Botany, Zo-

MAJORS AND MINORS IN THE VARIOUS SPECIFIED FIELDS

Span. j.	mi.	Botany mj.	mi.	Zoology mj.	mi.	Physics mj.	mi.	Chem. mj.	mi.	Geog. mj.	mi.	Pol. Sci. mj.	mi.	Econ. mj.	mi.	Sociol. mj.	mi.
5	X	25+	X	25+	X	25+	X	26+	X	X	X	40+	X	25+	X	25+	X
8	..	24	28	..	24	..	21	..	26	..	37	..	26	..
8	..	28	..	28	..	82	X	28	X	20	X	20	X	20	X	20	X
4	18	24	18	24	18	24	18	24	18	24	18	24	18	24	18	24	18
4	18	24	18	24	18	24	18	24	18	24	18	24	18	24	18	24	18
..	24	16	24	16	24	16	24	16	..	16
4	18	24	18	24	18	24	18	24	18	24	18	24	18	24	18	24	18
4	X	24	X	24	X	24	X	24	X	24	X	24	X	24	X	24	X
4	..	24*	..	24*	..	24	..	24	24	20
4	20	24	20	24	20	24	20	24	20	24	X	20	X	20	X
5†	..	25*	..	25*	..	25	14	25	14	X	X	X	X
4	15	24	15	24	15	25	14	25	14	X	X	X	X
8	18	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	30	20
5	10	25	10	25	10	25	10	25	10	25	10	25	10	25	10	25	10
X	X	X	X	X	X	20	10	30	10	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
0	12	20	12	20	12	20	12	20	12	20	12	20	12	20	12	20	12
X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	24	15	X	X	X	12	24	12	24	12
X	X	X	X	X	X	24	18	24	18	X	X	24	18	24	18	X	X
0	20	32	20	32	20	X	X	X	X	24	18	24	18
0	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20
0	20	30	20	30	20	30	20	30	20	30	20	30	20	30	20	30	20
0	..	40	..	40	..	40	..	40	..	40	..	40	..	40	..	40	..
0	20	30	20	30	20	30	20	30	20	30	20	30	20	30	20	30	20
2	36	25	15	25	15	24	14	25	16	25	14	25	15	24	15	25	15
4	12	20	13	20	12	27	?	27	20	22	12	14	X
4	15	24	15	24	15	24	15	24	15	24	15	X	X	X	X	X	X
0	20	27	16	27	16	27	16	27	16	27	16	27	16	27	16	27	16
7	18	30	15	30	15	29	15	45	15	30	15	30	15

Fields are chosen at least 8 hours must be in each of them.
†A major and minor is not provided in History alone,
but in Social Studies including at least 15 hours of history.
‡A major is not allowed in history alone, but it must
also include Political Science.

†A major and minor is not provided in History alone,
but in Social Studies including at least 15 hours of history.

ology, Physics, Chemistry, Astronomy, and Geology. Forestry is also recommended.

The University of Minnesota states its requirements for a group major in Natural Science as consisting of 20 semester hours in one of the four sciences: chemistry, physics, botany, zoology; 10 semester hours in a second science; 6 hours in each of two other sciences. This makes a total of 42 semester hours distributed over four sciences.

The outlines for group majors in the other institutions reporting follow much the same schemes indicated by these three universities.

It may be helpful and fitting to give in greater detail the outlines of one of these group or teaching majors and minors. The ones presented are those set up by the School of Education in the University of Michigan for prospective teachers of English. The outlines follow.

THE OUTLINE FOR MAJORS

For the purposes of high-school teaching the word "English is used as a single term to include not only the work in English and American Literature, but also the work in English Language and in English Composition and Rhetoric. Prospective teachers of English, therefore, are required to prepare themselves to deal with all three phases of this work in accord with the provisions of what is called the "English group major."

Special fitness for further work in this major will be tested by a *Qualifying Examination in English*, which must be taken by the prospective teacher before he may either elect the course in special methods or do any work in directed teaching. This examination will come, ordinarily, at the close of the junior year, but in exceptional cases it may be deferred until the beginning of the senior year. In this qualifying examination the student will be required to show:

a. A first-hand acquaintance with a substantial number of the important works of the leading English and American writers, and an understanding of the most significant facts of literary history.

b. An elementary knowledge of the historical development of the English language and of phonetics, with some conception of the sig-

nificance of these facts for the problems of modern English.

c. A knowledge of the working principles of rhetoric and an ability to apply that knowledge to his own thinking and communication.

The normal minimum preparation in the English group major will consist of 33 hours of carefully selected courses in accord with the program given below. If courses are elected at random the mere fact that the total number of hours equals 33 will not make the student an acceptable candidate for the Teacher's Certificate. The specific program to be followed should be arranged through consultation with the professor in charge of the teaching of English. The first consultation should be held, normally, at the beginning of the junior year and in no case later than the beginning of the senior year. Substitutions, for the specific major or minor may be made only with the consent of the professor in charge of the teaching of English.

The following principles should guide the selection of courses for the minimum program:

a. Certain important fields should be covered. The importance of a field is not to be determined solely by the amount of the material from it that is actually taught in the high school, but also by its value in providing the prospective teacher with a sound training in literary study, in giving a foundation for future growth and development, and in furnishing something of a satisfactory background for teaching literature.

b. In such a minimum program also the choice should be given to those particular courses in which the guidance of a teacher is especially necessary as opposed to those courses that can be satisfactorily covered by independent study.

In preparation for the English group major, therefore, the student should elect courses as follows:

I. In English Literature (21 to 24 hours):

Introductory, 31, 51, or 52; 3 hours.

American Literature, 181 or 182; 3 hours.

Medieval, 54; 3 hours.

Renaissance, 91, 163, or 164; 3 hours.

Shakespeare, 159 or 160; 3 hours.

Seventeenth Century, 112 or 172; 3 hours.

Eighteenth Century, 52, 177, or 178; 3 hours.

Nineteenth Century, 51, 121, 122, 125, 127, 128, 184, 192; 3 hours.

NOTE.—This program is for students who elect 24 hours of literature and 9 hours in the language and composition groups. If a combination of 21 hours in literature and 12 hours in language and composition is preferred, one field, say the seventeenth century, will be omitted.

II. *In English Language* (3 to 6 hours):

a. A minimum of 3 hours must be elected. English 107 is the only course fulfilling this minimum language requirement. Students who wish to satisfy this requirement in the Summer Session must elect both English 103s and 109s.

b. If the student wishes to elect 6 instead of 3 hours in language, he may choose his additional course from the following: English 103, 152, 162.

NOTE.—Only 2 hours credit will be granted for English 103 if English 107 has preceded. If two courses in the language group are elected the re-

I in the requirements for the English major.

II. *In English Language* (3 hours):

English 107; 3 hours.

III. *In English Composition, Rhetoric, and Criticism* (6 hours, exclusive of English 1 and 2. For the courses from which a selection may be made, see the list for majors.)

The *Qualifying Examination in English* must be taken if the candidate expects to do his directed teaching in this field. This should not be attempted until most of the course requirements for an English minor have been com-

TABLE IV

INSTITUTIONS PROVIDING GROUP OR TEACHING MAJORS AND MINORS, FIELDS OF WORK IN WHICH THESE ARE TO BE FOUND, AND THE SEMESTER HOURS REQUIRED.

INSTITUTION	ENGLISH		SOCIAL STUDIES		GENERAL SCIENCE		PHYSICAL SCIENCE		BIOL. SCIENCE		MATH.-SCIENCE	
	mj.	mi.	mj.	mi.	mj.	mi.	mj.	mi.	mj.	mi.	mj.	mi.
Battle Creek	30	x	40	x	x	x	25	x	25	x	30	x
Indiana	30	20	36	24	30	20	30	20	30	20	30	20
Illinois	x	x	x	x	35	25	x	x	35	25	x	x
Iowa	x	x	50	x	50	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Michigan	35	24	38	24	32	22	32	x	32	x	x	x
Minnesota	x	x	36	x	32	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Missouri	29	18	40	30	40	30	x	x	x	x	x	x
Nazareth	x	x	30	16	x	x	x	x	x	x	30	16
Northwestern	34	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Ohio State	30	20	20	x	x	x	30	20	30	20	30	20
University of Detroit	30	18	30	18	x	x	32	20	32	20	32	20
Wisconsin	28	x	?	?	?	?	x	x	x	x	x	x

quirement in English composition, rhetoric, and criticism will be proportionally reduced.

III. *In English Composition, Rhetoric, and Criticism* (6 to 9 hours, exclusive of English 1 and 2 and including at least one election from each of the following groups):

Group 1. English 47, 48, 66, 71, 72, 87, 88, 98, 149, 153, 154.

Group 2. English 61, 96, 101, 113, 114, 139, 140, 165, 166, 170, 179, 180.

NOTE.—The following type combinations may be worked out under the foregoing requirement: (1) Literature 21 hours, language 3, composition 9. (2) Literature 24 hours, language 3, composition 6. (3) Literature 21 hours, language 6, composition 6.

THE OUTLINE FOR MINORS

In preparation for the English group minor the student should elect courses as follows:

I. *In English Literature* (15 hours):

a. Introductory, 31, 33, 51, or 52; 3 hours.

b. Shakespeare, 159 or 160; 3 hours.

c. Nine hours distributed as evenly as possible over the other fields indicated under

pleted. Substitutions for the specific courses named for the minor may be made only with the consent of the professor in charge of the teaching of English.

SOME PERSONAL JUDGMENTS OF EDUCATORS

A second part of the study here being reported called, not for factual data but for the personal judgments of the deans or directors of the various teacher training institutions canvassed. Tables V and VI gives these judgments.

The first query under this division of the study was whether the writers would favor *requiring all* teachers, irrespective of their majors and minors, to have at least 15 semester hours in each of the three subjects, English, Social Studies, and Science. The vote stood 19 to 11 in favor of the idea, the schools of education approving the plan some-

what more uniformly than did the independent colleges.

Some of the comments made by the writers are as follows. Dean Smith of

number of hours required for the degree could be increased." Dean Arps of Ohio State said, "All teachers of secondary schools should have an adequate back-

TABLE V
PERSONAL ATTITUDES OF THOSE ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICERS WHO FILLED IN THE QUESTIONNAIRE
RESPECTING CERTAIN PROPOSED POLICIES

QUESTIONS	MICHIGAN COLLEGES			SCHOOLS OF EDUCATION ¹			TOTALS		
	Yes	No	Equiv. or no Reply	Yes	No	Equiv. or no Reply	Yes	No	Equiv. or no Reply
1. Do you favor requiring <i>all</i> teachers to have at least 15 semester hours of work in each of the following: English, Social Studies, Science?	12	9	0	7	2	0	19	11	0
2. Do you favor requiring <i>senior</i> high school teachers to have an additional major of approximately 25 hours?	10	10	1	5	2	2	15	12	3
3. Do you favor having group majors and minors in such fields as English, Social Studies and Science, and forbidding departmental majors and minors in such subjects? .	10	10	1	7	2	0	17	12	1
4. Do you favor requiring a fifth year for a secondary teacher's certificate (as in California)?	13	7	1	7	2	0	20	9	1
5. Do you favor a distinctive teacher-training curriculum for large senior or four year high schools?	6	13	2	2	5	2	8	18	4
6. Do you favor a distinctive teacher-training curriculum for small four year high schools?	6	13	2	2	5	2	8	18	4
7. Do you favor a distinctive teacher-training curriculum for junior high schools? .	7	12	2	3	5	1	10	17	3
8. Do you favor having a teacher broadly trained in many kinds of subject matter rather than to be more narrowly but deeply trained in the major and minor subjects? ²	11	3	7	4	3	2	15	6	9

¹Only 9 schools of Education are considered here, Wisconsin not categorically replying to the questions.

²Five of the Michigan institutions and two of out-of-state institutions said, "Both." These were recorded in the column "Equivocal or no reply."

Indiana replied, "Yes as a minimum." Sister Miriam Fidelis of Marygrove College wrote, "Yes, for English and Social Studies." Dean Irion of Missouri answered, "Desirable only if the total

ground in English, the Social Studies, and Science furnished by well integrated courses organized for purposes of orientation and not generally to meet the needs of specialists. I do not know the

PERSONAL JUDGMENTS OF THE VARIOUS DIRECTORS OF TEACHER TRAINING OR OF THE DEANS WHO REPLIED TO THE QUESTIONS AS PUT INTO SUM-
MARIZING FORM IN TABLE V

TABLE VI

INSTITUTION	Item 1	Item 2	Item 3	Item 4	Item 5	Item 6	Item 7	Item 8
A. MICHIGAN COLLEGES								
I. Public Institutions								
State Col. of Ag. and Mech. Arts . .	yes	yes	uncertain	no	no	no	no	Liberal culture
College of the City of Detroit . . .	no	yes	no	yes	yes	yes	yes	Specialization
Detroit Teachers College	yes	yes	yes	yes	no	no	no	Liberal culture
Central State Teachers College	yes	no	no	yes	no	no	yes	Moderate amount of both
Northern State Teachers College . .	yes	yes	no	no	yes	yes	yes	Specialization
Western State Teachers College	yes	yes	yes, ⁴ generally	yes	no	no	yes	Both
Michigan State Normal College . . .	yes	no	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	Liberal culture
II. Non-Public Institutions								
Adrian	no	no	yes	yes	no	no	no	Liberal culture
Albion	yes	no	yes	yes	no	no	no	Both
Alma	yes	yes	yes—no ²	yes	no ⁸	no ⁸	no ⁸	Both
Battle Creek	yes	yes	no	yes	no	no	no	Both
Calvin	no	yes	no	no	yes	yes	yes	Liberal culture
Emanuel	no ¹	no	yes	no	no	no	yes	Specialization
Hillsdale	yes	yes	yes	yes	no	no	no	Liberal culture
Hope	no	no	yes	yes	yes	yes	no	Liberal culture
Kalamazoo	yes	no reply	no	no reply	no	no	no	No reply
Marygrove	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	Liberal culture
Nazareth	yes	yes	no	yes	no reply	no reply	no reply	Liberal culture
Olivet	no	no	yes	yes	no reply	no reply	yes	Liberal culture
St. Joseph's	no	no	no	no	yes	yes	no	Liberal culture
University of Detroit	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	Both
SCHOOLS OF EDUCATION IN LARGE UNIVERSITIES								
Chicago	yes	yes	yes	yes	a	b	c	Liberal culture
Illinois	yes	yes	no	no	no reply	no reply	no	Liberal culture
Indiana	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	Liberal culture
Iowa	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	Specialization
Kansas	yes	?	yes	yes	?	?	?	Liberal culture
Michigan	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	Both
Missouri	no ⁴	no	no	yes ⁵	no	no	yes	Specialization
Northwestern	no	no	yes	yes	no	no	no	Liberal culture
Ohio State	yes	?	yes	yes	no	no	no	Both

¹But I would favor having two of the three together with a major of 25 hours.
²First part, yes; second part, no.
³Not yet! it savors of the thing we are trying to avoid.
⁴Desirable only if the total number of hours for the degree could be increased.
⁵Unworkable under present circumstances.

exact number of credit hours necessary to accomplish this. The actual college requirement for each student, of course, should take into account the background obtained by him in the secondary school." Assistant Dean Barnes of Olivet declared, "I do not see the need of setting a requirement of 15 hours in all three, especially science."

The second question asked if the writer would favor requiring for *senior* high school teachers the minors under *a* (the question just discussed) and in addition a major of approximately 25 semester hours. Here the vote was 15 to 12 with 3 equivocal. Counting the equivocal votes as negative the two sets of institutions—Schools of Education and independent colleges—divided in almost an exact ratio, with 50 percent for and 50 per cent against.

Few comments were made on this question, most writers categorically voting either "yes" or "no." Dean Schwegler of Kansas, however, said, "Not convinced. Prefer *a* for purposes of general orientation rather than for teaching." Dean Arps of Ohio wrote, "Our curriculum as it is being reorganized will probably provide for teaching competency in two fields. The standard will be based upon the achievement of the student rather than a specified number of hours of credit. Competency will probably be determined by an achievement examination."

Question three asked if the writer favored requiring group or teaching majors and minors in such subjects as English, Social Studies, and Science, and *forbidding* the more narrowly listed departmental majors and minors. To this question 17 voted yes, 12 voted no, and one was equivocal. Some comments were as follows. Professor Tyler of Alma: "First part, yes; second part, no." Dean Irion of Missouri: "Make provision for the group majors and minors but do not

forbid the narrower preparation." Dean Arps of Ohio State: "I should favor group majors in the social studies and in certain science groups. To make these groups too inclusive, however, would necessarily reduce the thoroughness of preparation in any one field." Assistant Dean Barnes of Olivet: "Yes, with reservations." Dr. Sangren of Western State Teachers College: "Yes in most cases, although it will differ with the students' needs, interests, and backgrounds."

Question four asked if the writer would favor requiring a fifth year for a secondary school teacher's certificate (as in California)—the fifth year to include both advanced academic and professional work but not necessarily leading to a master's degree.

Here the vote was 20 yes, 9 no and one not replying. Some comments are:

Alma: Yes, as soon as feasible.

Adrian: No, not at present; it will come later.

Detroit Teachers College: Yes, but I think it should lead to M.A. if the professional work is taken gradually over two or three years.

Michigan State: No, it is desirable but unfair to students under present professional procedures.

Missouri: I favor, but the plan is unworkable under present circumstances.

Ohio State: The difficulty of giving the secondary school teacher adequate preparation in four years points to the need of a five-year program.

Questions five, six, and seven inquired whether the writer would favor a distinctively outlined training curriculum (made up of specifically indicated academic courses and courses in Education) for prospective teachers in:

I. Large senior or four-year high schools

II. Small four-year high schools

III. Junior high schools

The votes here were:

I. Yes, 8; No, 18; Equivocal, 4.

II. Yes, 8; No, 18; Equivocal, 4.

III. Yes, 10; No, 17; Equivocal, 3.

It is evident that there is no strong sentiment (as reflected by the officials consulted) for any of these proposals. Some comments are:

Professor Tyler of Alma, "Not yet. It savors of a thing we are trying to avoid."

Dean Gray of the University of Chicago, "I doubt if you can differentiate so closely."

Dean Rooks of Calvin College, "I approve all three suggestions, with some elasticity."

Dean Lessenger of the Detroit Teachers College, "There should be a guided program but not as fixed as this proposal seems to indicate."

Dean Smith of the University of Indiana, "I approve so far as the bulk of the courses might be concerned but with some leeway."

Dean Schwegler of the University of Kansas, "I approve all if the course can be a five-year course."

Professor Austin of the Michigan State College, "I prefer certain constants with flexibility through variables."

Dean Arps of Ohio State University, "Because of the impossibility of predicting the destination of our graduates it hardly seems feasible to differentiate the curriculum as suggested in the questionnaire. I believe, however, that it should be possible to set up a strong five year program which would prepare teachers to meet reasonable standards for employment in large city high schools."

Assistant Dean Barnes of Olivet asks, "How much difference should be expected in the three types of curricula proposed?"

Dr. Sangren of Western State Teachers College, "Can't do it because of placement."

Finally, in question eight, officials were asked whether they favored having prospective teachers broadly trained in many kinds of subject matter (Liberal culture) or more narrowly trained to a higher degree in the major and minor subjects. Here the vote stood 15 for the broad liberal culture, 6 for a high degree of specialization, and 9 for a compromise that would give both types of training.

REACTIONS TO MICHIGAN'S RECOMMENDATIONS

The School of Education of the University of Michigan has for years published in its Annual Announcement a list of liberal culture courses which it

advises (but does not require) students to elect. In order to bring out judgments each dean or director of teacher training in the 31 institutions here canvassed was given a list of these courses (together with the suggested number of semester hours advised) and was asked whether he approved or disapproved of any of the items. Table VII gives the returns on this question. An analysis of this table shows that the subjects that were in greatest disfavor, as evidenced either by specific rejection or by non-approval through silence, are the following: Foreign languages, Organic Evolution and Heredity, and Survey of Biological Science. The vote on foreign language was: 11 favoring, 14 rejecting, and 6 non-committal. The vote on Organic Evolution and Heredity was: 17 favoring, 6 rejecting, and 8 non-committal and hence by implication rejecting. The vote on Survey of Biological Science was 11 favoring, 8 rejecting, and 12 non-committal.

Other subjects that stood only fairly well up in favor are: American Political Problems, with 11 votes against or at least not approving; Introduction to Art, Architecture and Music, with 10 not supporting; Introduction to Philosophy, with 11 not supporting; Personal Economics (budgeting, savings, investments, etc.) with 10 not approving; Survey of Physical Science, with 11 not supporting; and Philosophical Implications of the Concepts of Science, with 9 not approving.

It is not difficult to understand the biases of some individuals against the admission into teacher training courses of such subjects as foreign language (taken for but a year's time), organic evolution and heredity, and even contemporary social and political problems; it is not so easy to surmise the reasons for disapproving the various survey courses mentioned in the list given above. Perhaps it is the fact that the institutions

TABLE VII
ATTITUDES OF THE 31 RESPONDENTS TO THE QUESTIONNAIRE RESPECTING THE RECOMMENDATIONS BEARING ON LIBERAL CULTURE WHICH THE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION AT THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN SETS UP FOR THE GUIDANCE OF ITS STUDENTS

SUBJECT RECOMMENDED	Se- mes- ter hours	MICHIGAN COLLEGES						SCHOOLS OF EDUCATION				TOTAL	
		Public Institutions			Non-Public			Ap- prove	Re- ject	No Reply	Ap- prove	Re- ject	No Reply
		Ap- prove	Re- ject	No Reply	Ap- prove	Re- ject	No Reply						
1. Hygiene and Public Health	3	6	0	1	11	0	3	8	0	2	25	0	6
2. Freshman English	6	6	0	1	13	0	1	8	0	2	27	0	4
3. Foreign Language	8	2	4	1	9	3	2	0	7	3	11	14	6
4. American Government	3	6	0	1	12	0	2	8	0	2	26	0	5
5. American Political Problems	3	6	1	0	9	2	3	5	3	4	20	6	5
6. Personal Economics (Budgeting, Savings, investments, etc.)	3	5	1	1	8	2	4	8	0	2	21	3	7
7. Organic Evolution and Heredity	4	5	0	2	5	5	4	7	1	2	17	6	8
8. Introductory Architecture, Introductory Music, or Art Appreciation	3	6	0	1	7	3	4	8	0	2	21	3	7
9. Introduction to Philosophy	3	7	0	0	8	1	5	5	3	2	20	4	7
10. Survey of Physical Science	4	5	0	2	7	3	4	8	0	2	20	3	8
11. Survey of Biological Science	4	3	2	2	3	5	6	3	1	4	11	8	12
12. Philosophical Implications of Science ...	4	5	1	1	9	2	3	8	0	2	22	3	6
13. Survey Course in World History	4	6	0	1	11	1	2	7	0	3	24	1	6
14. Survey Course in American History	4	4	2	1	11	1	2	7	0	3	22	3	6
15. Survey Course in Literature	4	6	1	0	10	1	3	8	0	2	24	2	5
16. Current Social Problems (Sociology)	4	6	0	1	10	0	4	8	0	2	24	0	7
17. General Economics (Commercial processes, taxation, tariff, etc.)	4	7	0	0	9	1	4	8	0	2	24	1	6
18. Elementary Psychology	3	5	1	1	10	1	3	8	0	2	23	2	6

which the opponents represent are not at present equipped to deal with such courses in an effective way. Each reader must be his own judge in the matter.

The following are some criticisms that were made.

Professor Tyler of Alma: Foreign language is desirable if taught well; as it is it amounts to nothing. Further, many of the courses suggested should be combined, as for example, Organic Evolution, Heredity, Hygiene and Public Health; American government and politics; world history and American history in a survey course; Physical Science, Biological Science, and Philosophical Interpretations of the Concepts of Science.

Dean Gray of Chicago objects to Freshman English unless "needed" by individual students.

Dean Schwegler of Kansas objects to Heredity and Organic Evolution and would substitute Biology therefore.

Dean Anderson of Wisconsin asks: "Who knows the specific number of hours? Are the materials and values of hygiene one half those of freshman English?"

Professor Sangren of Western State Teachers College advocates combining many of the courses mentioned into a few courses and adds, "We can't have all."

Members of the Faculty of Kalamazoo College: "The word 'survey' is a broad and often abused term."

HOW TO DISTRIBUTE TIME

The last item on the questionnaire read as follows: If you had a free hand how would you distribute the 124 hours required for graduation (*a*) To major subject; (*b*) To first minor subject; (*c*) To second minor subject; (*d*) To Education subjects; (*e*) To cultural subjects different from those included in majors and minors.

Table VIII gives the returns on this question. Here again it is evident that there is little agreement in thought. Some individuals would assign fully half of the work to cultural subjects other than majors and minors; some would reduce this work to a small minimum. On the other hand, few seem to think that more than about 25 or 30 semester hours should be given over to one's major sub-

ject, with about two-thirds or one-half of this amount of time devoted to each of the two minors. Almost no one advocates more than 20 semester hours for Education, and it is certain that General Psychology is included in these figures by many who advocate that number of hours.

Here again it is very evident that school people are not in full agreement as to what is the best distribution of time for prospective teachers.

SUPPLEMENTARY STATEMENTS

In a few instances colleges did not return the questionnaire entirely filled out but instead wrote personal letters describing in general terms the policies that are being pursued by them. In some instances, too, the colleges that did return the questionnaires supplemented the data recorded thereon by personal letters or by sending clippings from their bulletins. The following are the more significant of these explanatory statements.

Professor W. S. Monroe, University of Illinois, says:

I believe that the number of hours for a major should vary with departments and perhaps should take into account the number of secondary units submitted for admission to the institution. In some fields it seems to me that a major of more than 18 hours does not have much justification while in other fields I should favor a major possibly in excess of 25 hours. . . . I attach considerable importance to general training. I think specialization has been considerably overemphasized in the training of secondary teachers. Many academic departments view a major from the standpoint of the training of a specialist in that department who will be prepared to undertake graduate study leading to the doctor's degree. For the training of secondary teachers I do not think this is a proper view.

Dean M. E. Haggerty, University of Minnesota, wrote:

We at Minnesota are definitely in a transitional period and are moving toward a broader requirement for prospective teachers in high

schools. At the last meeting of the faculty, for instance, we adopted a comprehensive curriculum for teachers in the natural sciences. We have done a similar thing in the social studies. It is possible within the ranges of each of these general set-ups for a student to take a major and a minor in a particular field but he would not be able to come to graduation on that basis alone. He would need to satisfy the other requirements of the combined curriculum.

We have never followed the practice of uniform credit requirements in our majors. In some fields these requirements are relatively low, as, for instance, in physics; in others they are very high, as in French. . . .

We have recently instituted a series of qualifying examinations at the end of the junior year which, if developed and made effective, will render credit hour requirements of secondary importance in this institution. When that

TABLE VIII
HOW THE VARIOUS INSTITUTIONS WOULD LIKE TO DISTRIBUTE THE 124 HOURS
REQUIRED FOR GRADUATION

Institution	To Major Subject	To First Minor Subject	To Second Minor Subject	To Edu- cation	To Cul- tural Sub- jects Other Than Majors and Minors
A. MICHIGAN COLLEGES (excluding University of Michigan)					
I. <i>Public Institutions</i>					
State College	32-35	20	14	20	35
College of the City of Detroit	20-40	15	x	15-20	60±
Detroit Teachers College	45	x	x	20	60±
Central State Teachers College	30	20	20	15	39
Michigan State Teachers College	30	15	15	15	49
Northern State Teachers College	32	20	20	20	32
Western State Teachers College	30-40	20	20	20	24-34
II. <i>Non-Public Institutions</i>					
Adrian College	24	16	12	20	48
Albion College	24	14	—	20	66
Alma College	24-30	20	15	24	40±
Battle Creek College	35	20	15	15	39
Calvin College	24-36	15-21	15	20-25	27-50
Emanuel College	25-40	15-25	15-25	20	40+
Hillsdale College	20-25	15	15	12-16	53-62
Hope College	40	25	20	25	14
Kalamazoo College	24-30	15-20	15-20	15-17	50±
Marygrove College	30	12	12	17	57
Nazareth College	24-40	12-20	9-15	15	34-64
Olivet College	35	20	15	20	34
St. Joseph College	18-30	12-20	12-20	20	34-64
University of Detroit	No answer				
B. SCHOOLS OR COLLEGES OF EDU- CATION IN LARGE UNIVERSITIES					
University of Chicago	—	—	—	—	—
University of Illinois	18-25	10-18	8-12	20	60±
University of Indiana	25	15	15	15	40*
University of Iowa	30	20	15	12	47
University of Kansas	30	20	20	20	34
University of Michigan	30	20	20	17	37
University of Minnesota	—	—	—	—	—
University of Missouri	40-45	30	15	20	29±
Northwestern University	"I prefer another kind of distribution." (Stout)				
Ohio State University	(Not stated categorically; see quotation following.)				
University of Wisconsin	20	15+	15+	15	50+

*With 14 or 15 more hours devoted to a *third* minor.

is done the task for a student will be to so prepare himself as to satisfy a broad comprehensive examination. The courses which he takes to meet this situation will be largely in his own hands. We have made so much progress on this program and it has been so cordially received by our academic people that only our own inability to make it effective will stand in its way of success. At the present time all of us are very hopeful about it.

Dean W. S. Gray, University of Chicago, wrote:

Steps are being taken to recognize teacher training in this institution, so that it is more largely than ever before the function of the University as a whole as contrasted with that of a single department. As soon as the new committee gets under way, many changes will doubtless be made in present procedures and requirements. At present the first two years must be in broad general fields. Of the last two year's work one-third must be in broad divisional courses, one-third in the subject of specialization, and one-third elective.

Dean J. E. Stout, Northwestern University, says:

The College of Liberal Arts has recently abandoned the major-minor plan of organization and requirement and has adopted in lieu thereof fields of concentration. We therefore do not require our students to major, we will say, in biology or botany but to take a composite program in these two subjects. Likewise in the field of social studies we do not permit our students to major in history alone, or political science, or any other social study, but require a composite program made up of selected courses from two or more of these subjects. In order to meet technical requirements for certificates in certain states we designate these programs as majors. . . . The teacher must become an *interpreter* of social relations and a guide in the education of boys and girls looking forward to their participation in social affairs.

Dean C. J. Anderson, University of Wisconsin, wrote:

Graduation from the School of Education and Recommendation for the University Teachers Certificate in academic subjects are based upon the following conditions and requirements.

- I. A total of 124 credits and 124 grade-points.
- II. The satisfactory fulfillment of a major subject and one or more minor subjects.

III. Fulfilling the course requirements for the B.A. or the Ph.B. degree.

IV. Fulfilling three of the following four group requirements:

1. Twelve credits in history and the social studies as follows: six credits in a year course in European or American history and six credits made up of three in political science and three in economics of sociology.

2. Five credits in the biological sciences and five in physical science.

3. Six credits in introductory philosophy and logic or eight credits in mathematics.

4. *a.* Ten credits in the literature of a foreign language, or

- b.* The passing of a proficiency test in one language, or

- c.* Intermediate knowledge of a second language.

V. Evidence of speech proficiency (made) in the form of either (*a*) a rating by the Speech Examination Committee of the School of Education, or (*b*) a grade in Speech 1.

VI. The recommendation of the departments of the major and minor subjects as to fitness for teaching.

VII. The presentation of a certificate of physical health and fitness from the University Medical Examiner.

VIII. The completion of 15 (specified) hours in education.

Registrar O. R. Stilson of Adrian College writes:

Adrian has this year (1933) adopted the 'Group System' which requires all students to distribute their work of the first two years over five groups of subjects and to concentrate in one of these groups during his junior and senior years to the extent of not less than a total of 50 hours nor more than a total of 70 hours. The five groups are, I), Freshman English, Freshman Foreign Language, and Orientation, II) Science, III) Social Studies, IV) Foreign Languages, Speech, Music, and Literature, V) Education, Philosophy, Psychology, and Religious Education.

Professor L. L. Tyler, Alma College:

Our training under present conditions is too discrete, discontinuous and pointless. It has not made for civic responsiveness or social sanity. It has failed as an integrating force and is lacking in philosophical anchorage. I would require more history and literature of Education and more Educational philosophy.

Dean H. L. Smith, University of Indiana writes:

License requirements are set by the State. We have built our B.S. requirements (in the School of Education) about the license requirements. The requirements for the A.B. degree (given by the Literary College) have no bearing on the license requirements.

Dean W. E. Lessenger, Detroit Teachers College:

Detroit Teachers College is very much in sympathy with the group major concept for secondary school teaching. I believe that five years of training should be required for all new applicants on the part of the better school systems of the state.

Dean G. E. Arps, Ohio State University:

Teaching training institutions are tremendously handicapped by the complete lack of correlation between subject combinations taught by inexperienced teachers and the subject combinations which they have been prepared to teach. Instead of permitting us to prepare teachers adequately in two fields of teaching we have been compelled to scatter our preparation to meet various possible combinations. This points to the need of very serious cooperative attention to this problem on the part of our State Departments of Education and the leading teacher training institutions.

In the teaching subjects students should be qualified as competent teachers of the subject and this competency should be determined by an actual test rather than based upon hours of credit without regard to quality of preparation. The time devoted to education subjects

should be adequate to qualify our prospective teachers to be teachers of boys and girls primarily, to give them an understanding of the growing child, to lead them to develop a philosophy of education and to give them the practical and theoretical training in the activities of teaching which will make them capable of attaining desirable educational objectives.

THE TWO TRENDS

It seems very evident from all these facts and opinions that some notable changes in the requirements of majors and minors are about to be made in many sections of the country. Specifically the trend seems to be toward broader training in fields directly related to the teacher's department of specialization and in consequence an increase in the number of semester hours allotted to the whole division of concentration. Thus, History as a major or minor is not to be acceptable, but in its stead a group of social studies is to be required. Likewise Physics or Chemistry standing alone will not serve as a major but both in combination. In similar way groupings of other related subjects are to be set up and students will be permitted to select from among the groupings.

A second trend, and one growing out of the first set of modified requirements, is one looking to the establishment of a five year course for the training of all secondary school teachers.

RECORD OF ATTENDANCE AT THE ANNUAL MEETING

THE following people were in attendance at the Annual Meeting of the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools held in Chicago, Illinois, March 20-22, 1933.

ARIZONA

Gammage, Grady, President, Arizona State Teachers College, Flagstaff.
Swetman, Ralph W., President, State Teachers College, Tempe.

ARKANSAS

Brothers, E. O., Dean, Junior College, Little Rock.
Brown, John E., President, John Brown Schools, Sulphur Spring.
Eldridge, H. E., Registrar, State A. & M. College, Jonesboro.
Hansbrough, L. D., Graduate Student, University of Chicago, Rector.
Hotz, H. G., Professor of Secondary Education, University of Arkansas, Fayetteville.
Hull, J. W., President, Arkansas Polytechnic College, Russellville.
Hutchinson, J. H., Dean, Monticello A. & M. Monticello.
Larson, J. A., Principal, Little Rock High School, Little Rock.
McAlister, H. L., President, Arkansas State Teachers College, Conway.
Owens, M. R., State High School Supervisor, State Department of Education, Little Rock.
Whitsitt, E. L., Dean, State A. & M. College, Jonesboro.
Womack, J. P., President, Henderson State Teachers College, Arkadelphia.

COLORADO

Cross, A. C., High School Visitor, University of Colorado, Boulder.
Duncan, D. Shaw, Dean of Graduate School, University of Denver, Denver.
Engle, W. D., Vice-Chancellor, University of Denver, Denver.
Greene, Charles E., Assistant Superintendent, Denver Public Schools, Denver.
Herbers, J. A., President, Regis College, Denver.
Jones, Mrs. Mildred S., Dean, Colorado Woman's College, Denver.

Mierow, Charles C., President, Colorado College, Colorado Springs.
Nelson, Alfred C., Registrar, University of Denver, Denver.

ILLINOIS

Abel, D. Herbert, Professor of the Classics, Loyola University, Chicago.
Abells, Harry I., Supt., Morgan Park Military Academy, Chicago.
Adams, Karl L., President, Northern Illinois State Teachers College, DeKalb.
Ager, Paul, W., Technical Secretary, National Committee on Student Reports for Institutions of Higher Education, Chicago.
Allen, Charles, Principal, Neoga Township High School, Neoga.
Allison, Carl W., Principal, High School, Champaign.
Allison, R. Y., Principal, Kankakee High School, Kankakee.
Anderson, Carl L., Principal, J. Sterling Morton High School, Cicero.
Anderson, Harry D., Principal, Ottawa Township High School, Ottawa.
Anderson, J. C., Principal, Luther Institute, Chicago.
Arnold, Frances M., Registrar, Francis W. Parker School, Chicago.
Ashley, Rebecca S., Principal, Roycemore School, Evanston.
Baggett, John E., Supt., Public Schools, Lake Forest.
Baker, John M., Professor of English, Lake Forest College, Lake Forest.
Barbour, Lillian, Registrar & Instructor, Ferry Hall, Lake Forest.
Beals, R. G., Supt., Township High School, DeKalb.
Benner, Thomas E., Dean, College of Education, University of Illinois, Urbana.
Biester, Fred L., Principal, Glenbard Township High School, Glen Ellyn.
Bishop, S. D., Principal, Community High School, West Chicago.
Blue, James E., Principal, Senior High School, Rockford.
Boucher, C. S., Dean of the College, University of Chicago.
Boyer, E. L., Principal, Bloom Township High School, Chicago Heights.
Bradford, John E., General Secretary, Board

- of Education of United Presbyterian Church, Chicago.
- Brewer, J. H., Principal, Peoria High School, Peoria.
- Brighthouse, Gilbert, Registrar, Chicago Christian High School, Chicago.
- Britt, Albert, President, Knox College, Galesburg.
- Brown, H. A., President, Illinois State Normal University, Normal.
- Buck, Howard L., Principal, Central Y.M.C.A. Evening High School, Chicago.
- Buckler, J. B., Principal, Township High School, Casey.
- Buford, J. L., Principal, Johnston City High School, Johnston City.
- Burgh, J. Frederick, Business Manager, North Park College, Chicago.
- Byerly, C. C., Supt., West Chicago Public Schools, West Chicago.
- Cherf, John T., Rector, St. Procopius College Academy, Lisle.
- Church, H. V., Secretary, Department of Secondary-School Principals, Berwyn.
- Clarke, William Francis, Dean, De Paul University Law School, Chicago.
- Clevenger, Arthur W., High School Visitor, University of Illinois, Urbana.
- Coe, W. C., Principal, Tremont Community High School, Tremont.
- Collins, G. R., Supt. of Schools, Tuscola.
- Collins, J. C., Teacher, Leo High School, Chicago.
- Condit, C. C., Supt. Township High School, Rantoul.
- Corbell, Oscar M., Supt., Township High School, Centralia.
- Corcoran, Francis V., President, De Paul University, Chicago.
- Cordell, R. V., Principal, Canton High School, Canton.
- Coultrap, H. M., Supt., Community High School, Geneva.
- Cramer, W. F., Secretary of Admissions, University of Chicago, Chicago.
- Crakes, C. R., Principal, Senior High School, Moline.
- Curtis, M. S., Principal, Leo High School, Chicago.
- Dawson, L. O., Supt., United Township High School, East Moline.
- Darnall, James D., Principal, Township High School, Geneseo.
- Davidson, W. J., Asst. Secy., Methodist Episcopal Board of Education, Chicago.
- Davies, E. C., Evening School of Commerce, Northwestern University, Chicago.
- De Butts, C. E., Principal, Tuley High School, Chicago.
- Deam, Thomas M., Asst. Supt., Township High School and Junior College, Joliet.
- De Wees, W. I., Principal, Amboy High School, Amboy.
- Diehl, Jacob, President, Carthage College, Carthage.
- Dodd, Albert G., Dean, Morgan Park Military Academy, Chicago.
- Dyrness, Enoch C., Registrar, Wheaton College, Wheaton.
- Eades, Roscoe, Principal, Township High School, Sterlin.
- Eavey, C. B., Chairman, Department of Education and Psychology, Wheaton College, Wheaton.
- Echols, Silas, Principal, Township High School, Mt. Vernon.
- Edwards, J. J., Principal, De Paul University High School, Chicago.
- Egan, Howard E., Dean, DePaul University, Chicago.
- Egan, Thomas, Dean, Loyola University, Chicago.
- Elzeav, Hugh, (Rev.) Teacher, St. Mel High School, Chicago.
- Emme, Earle E., Supervisory Asst. in Religious Education, University of Chicago, Chicago.
- Eversull, Frank L., Principal Senior High School, East St. Louis.
- Ewing, P. L., Supt. of Schools, Highland High School, Highland.
- Fairchild, R. W. School of Education, Northwestern University, Evanston.
- Elizabeth Faulkner, Principal, The Faulkner School for Girls, Chicago.
- Finnegan, W. A., Asst. Dean, Loyola University, Chicago.
- Finlayson, John L., Asst. Principal, Waller High School, Chicago.
- Fitzgerald, James A., Professor of Education, Loyola University.
- Foulkes, T. R., Asst. Principal, Maine Township High School, Des Plaines.
- Francis, Brother J., Principal, St. Patrick High School, Chicago.
- Gaffney, E. L., Dean, College of Arts & Sciences, De Paul University, Chicago.
- Garrett, R. E., Supt. of Schools, Belvidere.
- Giffany, O. E., Chairman, History and Science, Wheaton College, Wheaton.
- Goble, W. L., Principal, Elgin High School, Elgin.
- Goodier, W. A., Principal, Bloomington High School, Bloomington.
- Goreham, W. J., Principal, Township High School, Sidell.
- Gossard, A. P., Supt. of Schools, Marseilles.
- Gregory, J. W., Chairman, Board of Trustees, Shurtleff College, Alten.

- Hadden, S. B., Principal, Urbana High School, Urbana.
- Hagen, H. H., Principal, Crane Technical High School, Chicago.
- Haggard, W. W., Supt., Joliet Township High School and Junior College, Joliet.
- Hamilton, Frederic R., President, Bradley Institute, Peoria.
- Hancox, H. F., Director, Central Y.M.C.A. College, Chicago.
- Handlin, W. C., Principal, Community High School, Lincoln.
- Hanna, John Calvin, State Supervisor of High Schools, Springfield.
- Hansen, Herbert C., Principal, Austin Evening High School, Chicago.
- Hanson, Earl H., Principal, Senior High School, Rock Island.
- Hargis, Lloyd L., Principal, Township High School, Mt. Pulaski.
- Harmon, Cameron, President, McKendree College, Lebanon.
- Harris, John J., Principal, St. Rita High School, Chicago.
- Harrod, S. G., Dean, Eureka College, Eureka.
- Hibbard, Addison, Dean, College of Liberal Arts, Northwestern University, Evanston.
- Hobson, Cloy S., Principal, Township High School, Genoa.
- Hodapp, Aloys P., Dept. of Social Science, Loyola University, Chicago.
- Hooper, J. G., Instructor, Chicago College of Dental Surgery, Chicago.
- Horton, Byrese J., Professor of Education, De Paul University, Chicago.
- Hynduran, R. W., Supt., Canton Public Schools, Canton.
- Jeffries, U. B., Supt., Charleston Public Schools, Charleston.
- Jones, Hydee E., Asst. Supt., Morgan Park Military Academy, Chicago.
- Julius, Brother, Librarian, St. Mel High School, Chicago.
- Kelley, Robert M., President, Loyola University, Chicago.
- Keeler, Otis, Supt., Township High School, Marshall.
- Kelly, Glenn K., Supt., Riverside-Brookfield High School, Riverside.
- Kiekhofer, Luella (Miss), Teacher, College Preparatory School, Chicago.
- Kiniery, Paul, Assistant Dean, Graduate School, Loyola University, Chicago.
- Klein, H. L., Principal, De Paul High School, Chicago.
- Kleiner, Joseph L., Registrar, De Paul University, Chicago.
- Lawrence, Brother, Principal, De La Salle Institute, Chicago.
- Lehman, T., President, Elmhurst College, Elmhurst.
- Leinweber, W. J., Principal, Mooseheart High School, Mooseheart.
- Leies, Herbert F., Principal, Spalding Institute, Peoria.
- Lemon, J. S., Supt. of Public Schools, Blue Island.
- Letts, George L., Principal, York Community High School, Elmhurst.
- Lewis, A. B., Principal of Academic Department, Northwestern Military and Naval Academy, Lake Geneva.
- Liggett, W. A., Teacher, J. Sterling Morton Township High School and Junior College, Cicero.
- Liquori, Brother, Principal, St. Mel High School, Chicago.
- Lindsey, R. V., Principal, Community High School, Pekin, Illinois.
- Lockhart, A. V., Principal, Thornton Fractional Township High School, Calumet City.
- Loomis, Hiram B., Principal, Hyde Park High School, Chicago.
- Loomis, O. E., Principal, Hononegah Community High School, Rockton.
- Lord, L. C., President, Eastern Illinois State Teachers College, Charleston.
- Lorenzen, Clara H., Assistant Principal, Ferry Hall, Lake Forest.
- MacGuidwin, F. J., Instructor, Central Y.M.C.A. High School, Chicago.
- McClain, C. S., Dean, Olivet College, Olivet.
- McClelland, Clarence P., President, MacMurray College for Women, Jacksonville.
- McCoy, C. A., Principal, Community High School, Newton.
- McCoy, D. W., Principal, Springfield High School, Springfield.
- McDaniel, M. R., Superintendent, Oak Park and River Forest Township High School, Oak Park.
- McHugh, Daniel J., Professor, DePaul University, Chicago.
- McPheeters, W. E., Dean, Lake Forest College, Lake Forest.
- McPherson, H. W., President, Illinois Wesleyan University, Bloomington.
- McVey, William E., Superintendent, Thornton Township High School, Harvey.
- MacBoyle, R. E., Professor, Chicago College of Dental Surgery, Chicago.
- Maddox, William A., President, Rockford College, Rockford.
- Marr, Roy T., Instructor, Central Y.M.C.A. High School, Chicago.
- Marsh, Albert F., Instructor, Y.M.C.A. High School, Chicago.

- May, E. O., Graduate Student, University of Chicago, Chicago.
- Melton, Monroe, Superintendent of Schools, Normal.
- Merrifield, Anne M., Principal, Kenwood-Loring School for Girls, Chicago.
- Mettcalf, Albert C., Registrar, MacMurray College, Jacksonville.
- Meyers, H. E., Principal, Marengo Community High School, Marengo.
- Miller, S. C., Principal, Edward H. Abbott School, Elgin.
- Moore, B. C., Dean, Lincoln College, Lincoln.
- Moore, Herbert M., President, Lake Forest College, Lake Forest.
- Morgan, W. P., President, Western Illinois State Teachers College, Macomb, Illinois.
- Mother M. Imelda Fischer, President, St. Scholastica School for Girls, Chicago.
- Mother M. Loyola, Principal, Academy of Notre Dame, Belleville.
- Moyer, Anthony C., Assistant Principal, Weber High School, Chicago.
- Moyer, E. L., Principal, Senior High School, Galesburg.
- Multon, E. J., Dean of Graduate School, Northwestern University, Evanston.
- Murphy, Arthur M., Professor of Sociology, Loyola University, Chicago.
- Murphy, William M., Dean of Instruction, De Paul University, Chicago.
- Nelson, J. B., Principal, Batavia High School, Batavia.
- Newman, Phil J. (Rev.), Professor of Ethics, Routt High School, Jacksonville.
- Nichols, Fred C., Principal, Feitshaus High School, Springfield.
- Norton, A. C., Representative of Benj. H. Sanborn & Co., Decatur.
- O'Connell, D., Loyola University, Chicago.
- O'Hara, Jay L., Dean, James Millikin University, Decatur.
- Ohlson, Algoth, President, North Park College, Chicago.
- Pasek, J. Edwin, Dean of Commerce, Central Y.M.C.A. College, Chicago.
- Patterson, O. F., Superintendent, Shelbyville Public Schools, Shelbyville.
- Pence, Charles Edgar, Principal, Harvard School for Boys, Chicago.
- Perrine, Charles H., Principal, Medill High School, Chicago.
- Potter, George M., President, Shurtleff College, Alton.
- Preston, Etta S., Associate Principal, Roycemore School for Girls, Evanston.
- Prichard, C. E., Assistant Principal, Township High School, Waukegan.
- Probasco, Abbie, Principal, Jennings Seminary, Aurora.
- Quinn, John F., Principal, St. Ignatius High School, Chicago.
- Rall, E. E., President, North Central College, Naperville.
- Rea, A. A., Principal, West High School, Aurora.
- Renner, Theresa M., Registrar, Blackburn University, Carlinville.
- Richards, John M., Headmaster, Lake Forest Academy, Lake Forest.
- Robb, W. C., Principal, Proviso Township High School, Maywood.
- Robertson, R. M., Principal, Township High School, Rock Falls.
- Rudens, Samuel P., Educational Director, Jewish Peoples' Institute, Chicago.
- Saam, Theodore, Superintendent, Elgin Public Schools, Elgin.
- Sandwick, Richard L., Superintendent, Deerfield-Shields High School, Highland Park.
- Sayre, R. C., Principal, Senior High School, Decatur.
- Schacht, F. M., Principal, Christian Fenger Senior High School, Chicago.
- Schobinger, Elsie, Principal, Harvard School for Boys, Chicago.
- Schell, E. R., Dean, Wheaton College Academy, Wheaton.
- Schroeder, H. H., Dean, Illinois State Normal University, Normal.
- Schuh, John J., Principal, Central Catholic High School, East St. Louis.
- Shaffer, O. V., Principal, Princeton Township High School, Princeton.
- Shank, Marjorie, Registrar, Southern Illinois Normal University, Carbondale.
- Shelley, P. C., J. Sterling Morton High School & Junior College, Cicero.
- Shadoan, W. P., Superintendent, Roosevelt Military Academy, Aledo.
- Sister Agnes Mary, Teacher of Latin, Aquinas High School, Chicago.
- Sister Grace Alma, Teacher of English, Mt. St. Mary's Academy, St. Charles.
- Sister Ann Rose, Principal, St. Patrick High School, Kankakee.
- Sister Catherine Marie, Teacher of History, Aquinas High School, Chicago.
- Sister Delphine, Teacher, Visitation High School, Chicago.
- Sister Ignata, Principal, Josephinum High School, Chicago.
- Sister Jane Marie, Principal, Mt. St. Mary-on-the-Fox, St. Charles.
- Sister Josephine, Substitute for Directress, Ursuline Academy, Springfield.

- Sister M. Agatha, Loretto High School, Chicago.
 Sister M. Alberto, Principal, Visitation High School, Chicago.
 Sister M. Alexandrine, Principal, Trinity High School, River Forest.
 Sister M. Alexis, Principal, Bishop Muldon High School, Rockford.
 Sister M. Alma, Teacher, Madonna High School, Aurora.
 Sister M. Alureda, Science Teacher, Loretto High School, Chicago.
 Sister M. Ambrose, Principal, Loretto High School, Chicago.
 Sister M. Andrew, Superintendent, Mt. St. Mary-on-the-Fox, St. Charles.
 Sister M. Angeline, Science Teacher, Aquinas High School, Chicago.
 Sister M. Aquiline, Instructor, Mt. St. Mary-on-the-Fox, St. Charles.
 Sister M. Aquinas, Teacher of Science, Aquinas High School, Chicago.
 Sister M. Archangela, Superintendent, Alvernia High School, Chicago.
 Sister M. Blanche, Teacher, Mercy High School, Chicago.
 Sister M. Charlotte, Teacher, St. Michael Girls' High School, Chicago.
 Sister M. Clarine, Teacher of English, Trinity High School, River Forest.
 Sister M. Clementine, Teacher of English, Rosary College, River Forest.
 Sister M. Confirma, Principal, Madonna High School, Aurora.
 Sister M. De Lellis, Principal, Aquinas High School, Chicago.
 Sister M. Denise, English Teacher, Loretto Academy, Chicago.
 Sister M. DePaul, Instructor, Mt. St. Mary-on-the-Fox, St. Charles.
 Sister M. Dympona, Loretto Academy, Chicago.
 Sister M. Elizabeth, Principal, Alvernia High School, Chicago.
 Sister M. Faustina, Teacher, College of St. Francis, Joliet.
 Sister M. Genevieve, Science Teacher, Mt. St. Mary-on-the-Fox, St. Charles.
 Sister M. Hortense, Teacher, Loretto Academy, Kankakee.
 Sister M. Innocentia, Teacher, Aquinas High School, Chicago.
 Sister M. Jovita, Dean, College of St. Francis, Joliet.
 Sister M. Liberina, Teacher, St. Michael Central High School, Chicago.
 Sister M. Liquori, Principal, Holy Family Academy, Chicago.
 Sister M. Lorenzo, Loretto High School, Chicago.
 Sister M. Loretto, Principal, St. Teresa High School, Decatur.
 Sister M. Lucille, Music Director, Holy Family Academy, Chicago.
 Sister M. Lumena, American History Teacher, Trinity High School, River Forest.
 Sister M. Mark Kerin, Teacher, St. Xavier Academy, Chicago.
 Sister M. Mary Swyer, Teacher, Valla de Chantal, Rock Island.
 Sister Marie, Principal, Valla de Chantal, Rock Island.
 Sister Marie Daniel, Principal, St. Thomas, the Apostle, High School, Chicago.
 Sister Mary Agnella, Trinity High School, Bloomington.
 Sister Mary Agnita, Principal, Mercy High School, Chicago.
 Sister Mary Angela, Principal, Good Counsel High School, Chicago.
 Sister Mary Benedict, Principal, Trinity High School, Bloomington.
 Sister Mary Berilla, Principal, St. Mary's High School, Chicago.
 Sister Mary Bernardine, Principal, Academy of Our Lady, Chicago.
 Sister Mary Bernardo, Principal, St. Michael Central High School, Chicago.
 Sister Mary Charity, Principal, Aquin High School, Freeport.
 Sister Mary Coelina, Teacher, Aquinas High School, Chicago.
 Sister Mary Concepta, Head of English Dept., St. Patrick Academy, Des Plaines.
 Sister Mary Conceptia, Teacher, Holy Family Academy, Chicago.
 Sister Mary Consuella, Principal, The Immaculata High School, Chicago.
 Sister Mary Euphemia, Latin Teacher, Holy Family Academy, Chicago.
 Sister Mary Evelyn, Dean, Rosary College, River Forest.
 Sister Mary Francis, Chemistry Instructor, Holy Family Academy, Chicago.
 Sister Mary Geraldine, Principal, Providence High School, Chicago.
 Sister Mary Julianne, English Teacher, St. Michael Central High School, Chicago.
 Sister Mary Irene, Principal, St. Patrick Academy, Des Plaines.
 Sister Mary Lilirosa, English Teacher, Holy Family Academy, Chicago.
 Sister Mary Luella, Librarian, Rosary College, River Forest.
 Sister Mary Luke, Principal, St. Xavier Academy, Chicago.
 Sister Mary Peter, Latin Teacher, Aquinas High School, Chicago.

- Sister Mary Philemon, English Teacher, St. Michael Central High School, Chicago.
- Sister Mary Roberta, Science Teacher, Mercy High School, Chicago.
- Sister Mary Roberta, Principal, Loretto Academy (Woodlawn), Chicago.
- Sister Mary Ruth, President, Rosary College, River Forest.
- Sister Mary Theophane, Teacher, Holy Family Academy, Chicago.
- Sister Mary Zygmunt, Teacher, Good Counsel High School, Chicago.
- Sister Madeleine Sophie, Teacher, St. Michael Central High School, Chicago.
- Sister Michael James, Librarian, Aquinas High School.
- Sister Raphaelia, Teacher, Josephinum High School, Chicago.
- Sister Sebastian Cronin, Principal, St. Scholastica School for Girls, Chicago.
- Sister Tertulla, Provincial High School, Chicago.
- Singleton, Elizabeth (Miss), Headmistress, The Girls' Latin School of Chicago, Chicago.
- Smith, Dorothy L., (Miss), Secretary, University of Illinois, Urbana.
- Smith, Floyd, Principal, Benton Township High School, Benton.
- Smith, Gerard T., Principal, Starrett School for Girls, Chicago.
- Smith, J. H., Superintendent, West High School, Aurora.
- Smith, James M., Superintendent, Township High School, Lockport.
- Spelman, Walter B., Dean, Morton Junior College, Cicero.
- Starzynski, Mitchell, Principal, Weber High School, Chicago.
- Steele, M. E., Superintendent, Township High School, Mendota.
- Steen, Thomas W., President, Broadview College, La Grange.
- Stengel, C. Edw., Vice-President, Fox Valley High School, Aurora.
- Stevenson, Fred G., Superintendent, LaSalle-Peru Township High School and Junior College, LaSalle.
- Street, C. L., Headmaster, St. Alban's School, Sycamore.
- Stringer, Ralph E., Principal, Township High School, Robinson.
- Sullivan, S. B., Principal, Frankfort Community High School, West Frankfort.
- Taylor, E. H., Head of Mathematics Department, Eastern State Teachers College, Charleston.
- Thalman, John W., Superintendent, Township High School, Waukegan.
- Theophilus, Brother, Registrar, Holy Trinity High School, Chicago.
- Thisted, M. N., Principal, Western Illinois State Teachers College Academy, Macomb.
- Thrasher, Harry M., State High School Supervisor, Springfield.
- Toon, R. S., Principal, Community High School, Niantic.
- Tower, Willis E., District Superintendent of High Schools, Chicago.
- Towns, O. A., Principal, Community High School, Reddick.
- Tremain, Eloise R., Principal, Ferry Hall, Lake Forest.
- Underbrink, H. E., Principal, Township High School, Libertyville.
- Van Cleve, Charles F., Dean, Lyons Township Junior College, La Grange.
- Wakeley, John E., Principal, Danville High School, Danville.
- Wald, Arthur, Dean, Augustana College, Rock Island.
- Walker, E. T., Lewis Institute, Chicago.
- Wallgren, A. Samuel, Dean and Registrar, North Park Junior College and Academy, Chicago.
- Walters, O. V., Principal, East High School, Aurora.
- Wezeman, Frederick H., Principal, Chicago Christian High School, Chicago.
- Wiedrich, J. C., Superintendent of Schools, De Pue.
- Willet, G. W., Superintendent and Principal, Lyons Township High School and Junior College, La Grange.
- Wilmot, Harry L., Dean, LaSalle-Peru-Oglesby Junior College, LaSalle.
- Wilson, S. C., Teacher, Central Y.M.C.A. High School, Chicago.
- Wilson, Samuel R., Dean of Graduate School, Loyola University, Chicago.
- Wing, O. N., Principal, Central Y.M.C.A. Day High School, Chicago.
- White, Jesse Hayes, President, James Millikin University, Decatur.
- Woellner, Robert, Asst. Professor, University of Chicago, Chicago.
- Wohllenben, Francis J., Principal, St. Michael Central High School, Chicago.
- Wood, George A., Wood, Professor of History, Lake Forest College, Lake Forest.
- Wright, Wilbur H., Principal, Austin High School, Chicago.
- Young, O. O., Superintendent of Schools, Galesburg.
- Zoethout, W. D., Teacher of Physiology, C. C.D.S., Chicago.

INDIANA

- Baird, Cox, Principal, Senior High School, Logansport.
- Beabout, H. R., Principal, Lincoln High School, Plymouth.
- Blackwell, R. E., Director of Public Relations, Franklin College, Franklin.
- Blanchard, William M., Dean, De Pauw University, Greencastle.
- Borden, W. W., Superintendent of Schools, Whiting.
- Bruce, R. W., Professor of Psychology, Wabash College, Crawfordsville.
- Buck, George, Principal, Shortridge High School, Indianapolis.
- Coons, Charles S., Principal, Froebel High School, Gary.
- Downing, D. L., Superintendent of Schools, Covington High School, Covington.
- Elliott, Edward C., President, Purdue University, Lafayette.
- Engela, Bernice R., Director, Gary Public Schools, Gary.
- Feik, William (Rev.), Principal, Washington High School, East Chicago.
- Franzen, Carl G. F., Professor of Secondary Education, Indiana University, Bloomington.
- French, John M., Principal, La Pate High School, La Pate.
- Garretson, W. C., Principal, McLean Junior High School, Terre Haute.
- Gilbert, Mary, Registrar, Rose Polytechnic Institute, Terre Haute.
- Harmening, Daisy, Registrar, Manual Training High School, Indianapolis.
- Hertzler, Silas, Registrar, Goshen College, Goshen.
- Hoke, Verna M., Principal, Lew Wallace School, Gary.
- Holdenman, John W., Principal, Elkhart High School, Elkhart.
- Holl, Carl W., Dean of College, Manchester College, North Manchester.
- Hunt, Frederick L., Chairman of Faculty, Culver Military Academy, Culver.
- Imel, H. G., Principal, J. W. Riley High School, South Bend.
- Jameson, Ois G., Principal of Training School, Indiana State Teachers College, Terre Haute.
- Jones, J. W., Dean of the Faculty, Indiana State Teachers College, Terre Haute.
- Julian, Roy B., Superintendent of Schools, Valparaiso.
- Kern, Charles H., Principal, Mishawaka High School, Mishawaka.
- Kobelbrenner, B. J., Assistant Professor of Education, University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame.
- Kreinherder, O. C., President, Valparaiso University, Valparaiso.
- Kuhn, Ray, Superintendent of Schools, Plymouth.
- Kuntz, Leo F., Head of Dept. of Education, University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame.
- Kropf, Glen S., Assistant Principal, Riley Junior-Senior High School, South Bend.
- Lutz, Charles D., Principal, Horace Mann School, Gary.
- McComb, E. H. Kemper, Principal, Manual Training High School, Indianapolis.
- Michael, L. E., Superintendent, Clinton High School, Clinton.
- Miltner, Charles C., Dean of College of Liberal Arts, University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame.
- Morgan, D. S., Principal, Technical High School, Indianapolis.
- Murray, C. L., Director of Elementary and High Schools, Indianapolis.
- Myers, Russell R., Principal, Roosevelt Junior-Senior High School, East Chicago.
- Osborn, O. C., Assistant Principal, Central Senior High School, South Bend.
- Parker, Albert G., President, Hanover College, Hanover.
- Prentice, D. B., President, Rose Polytechnic Institute, Terre Haute.
- Putnam, J. W., Dean and Vice-President, Butler University, Indianapolis.
- Scribner, A. F., Registrar, Valparaiso University, Valparaiso.
- Spannon, J. R., Professor, Indiana State Teachers College, Terre Haute.
- Sister Eugenia, Dean, St. Mary-of-the-Woods College, St. Mary-of-the-Woods.
- Sister Francis Joseph, Supervisor of Schools, St. Mary-of-the-Woods College, St. Mary-of-the-Woods.
- Sister M. Evangelista, Principal, St. Mary's Academy, Notre Dame.
- Spaulding, E. A., Principal, Emerson School, Gary.
- Spohn, A. L., Principal, Hammond High School, Hammond.
- Stantz, Guy, Principal, Gerstmeyer Technical High School, Terre Haute.
- Stoler, Fred W., Principal, High School, Anderson.
- Stuart, Milo H., Assistant Superintendent of Public Schools, Indianapolis.
- Tatlock, V. L., Principal, Bloomington High School, Bloomington.
- Torbet, Charles E., Dean, Evansville College, Evansville.

Wagoner, W. E., Secretary-Registrar, Ball State Teachers College, Muncie.
 Worthman, M. F., Superintendent, Decatur High School, Decatur.

IOWA

Boylan, J. J. (Rev.), Principal, Des Moines Catholic Academy, Des Moines.
 Brian, Robert E., President, Morningside College, Sioux City.
 Briggs, G. N., President, Graceland College, Lamom.
 Burgstahler, J. H., President, Cornell College, Mt. Vernon.
 Davis, George E., Principal, Senior High School, Keokuk.
 Douma, Frank W., Principal, Ottumwa High School, Ottumwa.
 Foster, J. E., Dean of Summer Quarter, Iowa State College, Ames.
 Gemmill, W. H., Iowa State Board of Education, Des Moines.
 Greene, Clarence W., President, Parsons College, Fairfield.
 Johnson, R. W., Principal, Senior High School, Dubuque.
 Kirby, Thomas J., Professor of Education, University of Iowa, Iowa City.
 Latham, O. R., President, Iowa State Teachers College, Cedar Falls.
 Lyons, L. V. (Rev.), Registrar, Des Moines Catholic Academy, Des Moines.
 Morehouse, L. W., President, Drake University, Des Moines.
 Morris, M. G., Registrar, St. Ambrose College, Davenport.
 Mother M. Geraldine, President, Ottumwa Heights College and Academy, Ottumwa Heights.
 Nollen, John S., President, Grinnell College, Grinnell.
 Preus, O. H. J., President, Luther College, Decorah.
 Proehl, Otto L., President, Warburg College, Clinton.
 Sage, J. R., Registrar, Iowa State College.
 Schneider, F. W., Vice-President, Morningside College, Sioux City.
 Shirley, William F., Superintendent of Schools, Marshalltown.
 Sibbing, Paul A., Registrar, Trinity College High School, Sioux City.
 Sister Hazel Marie Roth, Dean, Ottumwa Heights College, Ottumwa.
 Sister M. Augusta, Voice Teacher, Mt. St. Clare College, Clinton.
 Sister M. Idephonse, President, Mt. Mercy Junior College and Academy, Cedar Rapids.

Sister Mary Angelice, Teacher, Immaculate Conception Academy, Davenport.
 Sister Mary Aquinas, Dean, Briar Cliff College, Sioux City.
 Sister Mary Aurelia, Principal, Mt. St. Clare Academy, Clinton.
 Sister Mary Carlos, Principal, Immaculate Conception Academy, Dubuque.
 Sister Mary Corona, Principal, Xavier High School, Dyersville.
 Sister Mary Edmundine, Principal, Immaculate Conception Academy, Davenport.
 Sister Mary Josephine, Principal, Visitation Academy, Dubuque.
 Sister Mary Louise Genevieve O'Mara, Teacher, Visitation Academy, Dubuque.
 Sister Mary Patrice, President, Clark College, Dubuque.
 Sister Mary Petra, Principal, Immaculate Conception Academy, Davenport.
 Sister Mary Regma, Dean of Studies, Clarke College, Dubuque.
 Sister Mary Richard, English Department, Clarke College, Dubuque.
 Sister Mary St. Helen, Registrar, Clarke College, Dubuque.
 Sister Mary Servatius, President, Briar Cliff College, Sioux City.
 Sister Mary Xavier, Dean, Mt. Mercy Junior College, Cedar Rapids.
 Williams, S. N., Professor Emeritus, Cornell College, Mt. Vernon.
 Zuker, W. B., Vice-President, University of Dubuque, Dubuque.

KANSAS

Campbell, R. T., President, Sterling College, Sterling.
 Edgerton, J. E., High School Supervisor, Topeka.
 Foght, H. W., President, University of Wichita, Wichita.
 Kaufman, E. G., President, Bethel College, Newton.
 Kelly, John Bailey, President, College of Emporia, Emporia.
 King, Philip C., President, Washburn College, Topeka.
 Lee, F. B., Dean, Fort Hays Kansas State College, Hays.
 McGrath, Robert F., Head of Dept. of Education, Fort Hays Kansas State College, Hays.
 Mendenhall, W. O., President, Friends University, Wichita.
 Mother M. Lucy Dooley, President, Mt. St. Scholastica College, Atchison.
 Parker, R. L., Professor, Fort Hays Kansas State College, Hays.

Pihlblad, Ernest F., President, Bethany College, Lindsborg.
 Poundstone, W. J., Registrar, Southwestern College, Winfield.
 Schmitz, Sylvester B., Dean, St. Benedict's College, Atchison.
 Schwimn, Bonaventure, St. Benedict's College High School, Atchison.
 Sister M. Immaculata, Registrar, Mt. St. Scholastica College, Atchison.
 Sister M. Immaculata, President, Registrar, Mt. St. Scholastica College, Atchison.
 Sister Mary, Librarian, St. Mary Academy, Leavenworth.
 Sister M. Bertilla, High School Supervisor, Marymount Academy, Salina.
 Sister Mary Clemenga, Provincial Superior, Mt. Carmel Academy, Wichita.
 Sister Mary Nicholas, Registrar, Marymount College, Salina.
 Sister Rose Cominic, Dean, St. Mary College, Leavenworth.
 Stouffer, E. B., Dean of Graduate School, University of Kansas, Lawrence.

MICHIGAN

Anspach, C. L., Head of Dept. of Education, Michigan State Normal College, Ypsilanti.
 Bradshaw, C. R., Principal, Lincoln High School, Ferndale.
 Brown, Ernest E., President, Ferris Institute, Big Rapids.
 Coffey, Wilford L., Dean, College of the City of Detroit, Detroit.
 Congdon, W. H., Assistant Director, Bureau of Cooperation with Educational Institutions, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.
 Craig, John A., Superintendent of Schools, Muskegon.
 Crooks, H. M., President, Alma College, Alma.
 Davis, C. O., Professor, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.
 Dear, R. Ernest, Principal, L. L. Wright High School and Ironwood Junior College, Ironwood.
 Duggan, L. F., Registrar, Michigan College of Mining and Technology, Houghton.
 Edmonson, J. B., Dean of School of Education, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.
 Edwards, H. E., Director of Dept. of Education Emmanuel Missionary College, Berrien Springs.
 Effinger, John R., Dean, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.
 Emmons, Owen A., Principal, Cooley High School, Detroit.
 Everett, John P., Western State Teachers College, Kalamazoo.
 Forsythe, L. L., Principal, Senior High School, Ann Arbor.
 Froehke, Helen C., Director of Physical Education, St. Mary Academy, Monroe.
 Herron, C. L., Acting President, Hillsdale College, Hillsdale.
 Hoppough, Cora L., Registrar, Battle Creek College, Battle Creek.
 Johnston, Edgar G., Principal, University High School, Ann Arbor.
 Kuebler, Freda, University of Michigan.
 Lessinger, W. E., Dean, Detroit Teachers College, Detroit.
 Leffler, Emil, President, Battle Creek College, Battle Creek.
 Manning, George A., Principal, Senior High School.
 Miller, E. L., Asst. Supt., Detroit.
 Mulvey, John A. (Rev.), Supt. Sacred Heart Academy, Mt. Pleasant.
 Munson, J. M., President, Northern State Teachers College, Marquette.
 Poetker, A. H. (Rev.), President, University of Detroit, Detroit.
 Post, Egbert R., Principal, Grand Rapids Christian High School, Grand Rapids.
 Rivett, B. J., Principal, Northwestern High School, Detroit.
 Seaton, John L., President, Albion College, Albion.
 Sister Anges Rita, Dean, St. Joseph's College, Adrian.
 Sister Jane Main Murray, Instructor, Catholic Junior College, Grand Rapids.
 Sister M. Alphonsine, Science Teacher, St. Mary School, Saginaw.
 Sister M. Aquinas, Supervisor, Sisters of St. Dominic, Marywood, Grand Rapids.
 Sister M. Evangelista, Directress of Studies, St. Mary Academy, Monroe.
 Sister M. Felix, Registrar, Catholic Junior College, Grand Rapids.
 Sister M. Gerald, President, St. Joseph's College, Adrian.
 Sister M. Stella, Directress, Nazareth Academy, Nazareth.
 Sister Mary Jane, Science Teacher, Marywood Academy, Grand Rapids.
 Sister Mary Lucille Middleton, Principal, Mt. Mercy Academy, Grand Rapids.
 Sister Mary Marguerite, English Teacher, Mt. Mercy Academy, Grand Rapids.
 Sister Miriam Fidelio, Registrar, Marygrove College, Detroit.
 Sister Miriam Patricia, Librarian, St. Joseph's College, Adrian.
 Smith, Ira W., Registrar, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.

Steele, Harold, Superintendent of Schools, Jackson.
 Sweeney, R. J. (Rev.), Principal, Catholic Central High School, Grand Rapids.
 Umbreit, A. G., Director, Muskegon Junior College, Muskegon.
 Wichers, Wynard, President, Hope College, Holland.
 Wood, Lynn H., President, Emmanuel Missionary College, Berrien Springs.

MINNESOTA

Acheson, John C., President, Macalester College, St. Paul.
 Boardman, C. W., Professor, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis.
 Boe, L. W., President, St. Olaf College, Northfield.
 Brother Cassian, Principal, De La Salle High School, Minneapolis.
 Brother Joseph, Principal, Cotter High School, Winona.
 Brown, J. N., President, Concordia College, Moorhead.
 Burke, Joseph, Principal, St. Thomas Military Academy, St. Paul.
 Cunningham, W. L., Dean of Studies, College of St. Thomas, St. Paul.
 Flynn, W. E., Director of Elementary Schools, St. Paul.
 Gibson, P. H., Dean, Eveleth Junior College, Eveleth.
 Guire, C. C., Dean, Greenway High School, Coleraine.
 Haggerty, M. E., Dean, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis.
 Haun, J. W. (Rev.), Dean, St. Mary's College, Winona.
 Kuhlman, C. B., Professor of Economics, Hamline University, St. Paul.
 Nell, R. B., Dean, Hamline University, St. Paul.
 Sattre, A. M., Representative of Minnesota Intercollegiate Athletic Assn., Concordia College, Moorhead.
 Schabert, J. A., Dean, St. Thomas College, St. Paul.
 Schmidt, W. F., President, St. Paul Luther College, St. Paul.
 Sister Adelgundis, Librarian Assistant, College of St. Benedict, St. Joseph.
 Sister Adelis, Principal, St. Benedicts Academy, St. Joseph.
 Sister Antonia, President, College of St. Catherine, St. Paul.
 Sister Claire Lynch, Dean, College of St. Benedict, St. Joseph.
 Sister Eva, Principal, St. Joseph's Academy, St. Paul.

Sister M. Alice, Dean, College of St. Scholastica, Duluth.
 Sister M. Alonzo, Principal, St. Augustine High School, Austin.
 Sister M. Edith, Principal, St. John High School, Rochester.
 Sister M. Jane Frances, Principal, Sacred Heart High School, Waseca.
 Sister Mary, Villa St. Scholastica High School, Duluth.
 Sister St. Helene, Superintendent, Derham Hall High School, St. Paul.
 Rosa, Irvin E., Principal, Junior-Senior High School, Owatonna.
 Todd, J. E., Director of Admissions, Carleton College, Northfield.
 Vogel, Herbert, Registrar, St. Paul Luther College, St. Paul.

MISSOURI

Adams, E. R., Public Schools, Chillicothe.
 Blackuce, Thomas E., Comptroller, The Principia, St. Louis.
 Brother James, Teacher, Christian Brothers High School, St. Louis.
 Bryan, W. J. S., Adviser, St. Louis Public Schools, St. Louis.
 Bryan, Mrs. W. J. S., St. Louis.
 Chiles, Ira N., President, Central Wesleyan College, Warrenton.
 Conway, Daniel H., President, Rockhurst Academy, Kansas City.
 Dailey, A. L., Principal, Lafayette Senior High School, St. Joseph.
 Deneke, Wesley A., Dean, Flat River Junior College, Flat River.
 Dieterich, H. R., Principal, College High School, Maryville.
 Donovan, G. F., President, Webster College, Webster Groves.
 Douglass, R. S., Dean, State Teachers College, Cape Girardeau.
 Dubach, Otto F., Principal, Central High School, Kansas City.
 Elliff, J. D., High School Visitor, University of Missouri, Columbia.
 Ellis, Roy, President, Southwest Missouri State Teachers College, Springfield.
 Eubank, L. A., Dean, Northeast Missouri Teachers College, Kirksville.
 Fair, Eugene, President, Northeast Missouri State Teachers College, Kirksville.
 Gipson, Alice E., Dean, Lindenwood College, St. Charles.
 Hendricks, E. L., President, State Teachers College, Warrensburg.
 Hitch, A. M., Supt., Kemper Military School, Boonville.

Hopkins, L. S., Dean, Culver-Stockton College, Canton.
 Huebert, Charles E., Principal, McBride High School, St. Louis.
 Johnson, B. Lamar, Dean, Stephens College, Columbia.
 Johnston, Robert F., President, St. Louis University, St. Louis.
 Keith, Ruth (Miss), Dean of Faculty, William Woods College, Fulton.
 Kimber, Jean, Registrar, Harris Teachers College, St. Louis.
 Knapp, Thomas M., Dean, St. Louis University, St. Louis.
 Lamdin, M. W., President, Northwest Missouri State Teachers College, Maryville.
 Moon, Allen J., Dean, William Jewell College, Liberty.
 O'Loane, Mary T., Dean, Maryville College, St. Louis.
 Powell, J. R., Asst. Supt., Roosevelt High School, St. Louis.
 Puckett, E. P., Dean, Central College, Fayette.
 Purdom, J. Leslie, Principal, Harris Teachers College, St. Louis.
 Rufi, John, Professor of Education, University of Missouri, Columbia.
 Sanford, O. G., Assistant State Superintendent of Schools, Jefferson, City.
 Schwitalla, Alphonse M., Dean of School of Medicine, St. Louis University, St. Louis.
 Serna, Joseph A., President, Southeast Missouri State Teachers College, Cape Girardeau.
 Sheley, Dannelle (Miss), Registrar, William Woods College, Fulton.
 Shipley, Frederick W., Dean, Washington University, St. Louis.
 Shofstall, M. P., Dean of Administration, Stephens College, Columbia.
 Shouse, John L., Assistant Supt. of Schools, Kansas City.
 Sister Helen Marie, Asst. Principal, Rosati-Kain High School, St. Louis.
 Sister M. Benedette, Asst. Principal, Rosati-Kain High School, St. Louis.
 Sister M. Caecilia, St. Mary's Junior College, O'Fallon.
 Sister Marie Deslattes, Principal, Academy of the Sacred Heart, St. Charles.
 Sister Mariette, Principal, St. Teresa Academy, Kansas City.
 Sister Mary Augusta, St. Elizabeth Academy, St. Louis.
 Sister Mary Qugenia, Registrar, Notre Dame Junior College, St. Louis.
 Sister Mary Heury Siegel, Principal, St. Joseph's Academy, St. Louis.
 Sister Mary Paula, Principal, Sancta Maria in

Ripa High School, St. Louis.
 Stellwagon, Herbert P., Principal, Soldan High School, St. Louis.
 Sweazey, G. B., Dean, Westminster College, Fulton.
 Treadaway, Thomas J., Vice-President, Cham-inade College Academy, Clayton.
 Weiland, J. A., Principal, St. Louis University High School, St. Louis.
 Wood, J. H., President, Culver-Stockton College, Canton.
 Wood, J. M., President, Stephens College, Columbia.

MONTANA

Ireland, Elizabeth (Miss), Superintendent of Public Instruction, Helena.
 Riley, Emmet, Acting President, Carrol College, Helena.

NEBRASKA

Crite, Edwin D., State Board of Education, Chadron
 Dean, Edwin B., President, Doane College, Crete.
 Deglman, George A., Dean, Creighton University, Omaha.
 Elliott, Robert I., President, Chadron State Teachers College, Chadron.
 French, C. H., President, Hastings College, Hastings.
 Hellman, Walter H., President, Hebron Academy, Hebron.
 Hewit, Edna, University of Nebraska, Lincoln.
 John, Alvin W., Dean, Union College, Lincoln.
 McGahey, Florence I., Registrar, University of Nebraska, Lincoln.
 Martin, G. E., President, Nebraska State Teachers College, Kearney.
 Masters, J. G., Principal, Omaha Central High School, Omaha.
 Oldfather, C. H., Dean, College of Arts and Sciences, University of Nebraska, Lincoln.
 Pate, W. R., President, Nebraska State Teachers College, Peru.
 Reed, A. A., University Examiner, University of Nebraska, Lincoln.
 Rosenlof, G. W., Director of Secondary Education, State Department of Public Instruction, Lincoln.
 Sealock, W. E., President, Municipal University of Omaha, Omaha.
 Sloniger, Zazel, Registrar, Nebraska Wesleyan University, Lincoln.

NEW MEXICO

Gossard, H. C., President, New Mexico Normal University, Las Vegas.

NORTH DAKOTA

- Kroeze, B. H., President, Jamestown College, Jamestown.
 Page, John A., High School Inspector, State Department of Public Instruction, Bismarck.
 Tighe, B. C. B., Principal, Fargo Senior High School, Fargo.

OHIO

- Ankenbrand, W. W., Supt. of Schools, Rocky River City Schools, Rocky River.
 Anderson, Earl W., Associate Professor of Education, Ohio State University, Columbus.
 Ashbaugh, E. J., Dean of Education, Miami University, Oxford.
 Ave, Harold C., Principal, Willoughby High School, Willoughby.
 Blair, John L., Dean of College of Education, Kent State College, Kent.
 Bohn, J. E., Principal, Public High School Ashland.
 Church, H. H., Principal, Ross Fremont High School, Fremont.
 Doult, H. M., Head of the Dept. of Secretarial Science, University of Akron, Akron.
 Dunathan, Homer R., President, Findlay College, Findlay.
 Ferne, W. J. (Rev.), Capital University, Columbus.
 Fitch, Donald R., Registrar, Denison University, Granville.
 Fitcher, Joseph W., Assistant Director, State Dept. of Education, Columbus.
 Fitcher, J. W., (Mrs.), Columbus.
 Fitcher, Jean, Columbus.
 Fox, Albert C., Dean, John Carrol University, Cleveland.
 Gardner, D. H., Dean of Men, University of Akron, Akron.
 Goetting, M. L., Ohio State University, Columbus.
 Gosling, Thomas W., Superintendent, Akron Public Schools, Akron.
 Hickok, Ralph K., President, Western College, Oxford.
 Jacobs, E. E., President, Ashland College, Ashland.
 Krick, W. J., Principal, High School, Van Wert.
 Landis, Emerson H., Assistant Superintendent of Schools, Dayton.
 Love, Donald M., Assistant Dean of Oberlin College, Oberlin.
 MacKinnon, L. W., Vice-President, University of Toledo, Toledo.
 Matteson, I. F., Superintendent of Schools, Findlay.

- Miller, Wade E., Principal, Senior High School, Middletown.
 Montgomery, Robert A., President, Muskingum College, New Concord.
 Morley, E. E., Principal, Cleveland Heights High School, Cleveland Heights.
 Mother M. Adelaide, President, St. Clare Academy, Sylvania.
 Mother M. Veronica, President, Ursuline College, Cleveland.
 Ogan, R. W., Dean, Muskingum College, New Concord.
 Ottermann, Charles, Assistant Superintendent, Cincinnati Public Schools, Cincinnati.
 Patin, R. B., Principal, Slaker High School, Slaker Heights.
 Pottorf, John L., Principal, McKinley High School, Canton.
 Reavis, G. H., State Supervisor of High Schools, Columbus.
 Sheridan, Harold J., Professor, Ohio Wesleyan University, Delaware.
 Sister Adriana, Directress, Mt. St. Joseph Academy, Mt. St. Joseph.
 Sister Blandine, Principal, St. Joseph Academy, Columbus.
 Sister Ernestine, Principal, Summit Country Day School, Cincinnati.
 Sister Jane de Chantal, Dean, St. Mary's of the Springs College, East Columbus.
 Sister Letitia, Principal, Ursuline Academy, Cleveland.
 Sister Loretto, Teacher, Notre Dame Academy, Reading.
 Sister M. Bernardine, President, St. Mary's of the Springs Academy, East Columbus.
 Sister M. Celestine, Principal, Ursuline Academy of the Sacred Heart, East Cleveland.
 Sister M. Consolata, Principal, Ursuline Academy—Villa Angela, Cleveland.
 Sister M. Constance, Science Teacher, St. Augustine Academy, Lakewood.
 Sister M. Josaphat, Teacher, St. Joseph Convent, Garfield Heights.
 Sister M. Paul Johnston, Principal, St. Augustine Academy, Lakewood.
 Sister M. Stanislas, Principal, St. Clare Academy, Sylvania.
 Sister Mary Agnes, Dean, Notre Dame College, South Euclid.
 Sister Mary Aldona, Principal, St. Joseph Academy, Garfield Heights.
 Sister Mary Aquinas, Dean, Mary Manor College, Toledo.
 Sister Mary Genevieve, Librarian, Notre Dame College, South Euclid.
 Sister M. Gonzaga, Dean, Ursuline College, Cleveland.

Sister Mary Grace, Registrar, Ursuline College, Cleveland.
 Sister Mary Zoe, Dean, College of Mt. St. Joseph-on-the-Ohio, Cincinnati
 Sister Pulcheria Whelan, President, Mary Mance College, Toledo.
 Sloctemyer, Hugo F., President, Xavier University, Cincinnati.
 Smittle, W. Ray, Assistant in Higher Education, Ohio State University, Columbus.
 Storms, Albert B., President, Baldwin-Wallace College, Berea.
 Stradley, B. L., University Examiner, Ohio State University, Columbus.
 Sutton, David H., Dept. of School Administration, Ohio State University, Columbus.
 Tredtin, (Rev.) Walter C., President, University of Dayton, Dayton.
 Tulloss, R. E., Wittenberg College, Springfield.
 Upham, A. H., President, Miami University, Oxford.
 Yeske, (Rev.) Lawrence, President, Cathedral Latin School, Cleveland.
 Young, John J., Principal, Rocky River High School, Rocky River.
 Zook, George F., President, University of Akron, Akron.

OKLAHOMA

Finlayson, John D., Chancellor, University of Tulsa, Tulsa.
 Gittinger, Roy, Dean of Administration, University of Oklahoma, Norman.
 McCash, I. N., President, Phillips University, Enid.
 Morrisett, L. N., Principal, Classen High School, Oklahoma City.
 Morrison, E. L., High School Inspector, State Department of Education, Oklahoma City.
 Wells, George C., Supervisor of Indian Education for Oklahoma, United States Department of Interior, Oklahoma City.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Granskon, Clemens M., President, Augustana College, Sioux Falls.
 Kraushaar, R. W., State High School Supervisor, State Department of Public Instruction, Pierre.
 Sattgast, C. R., President, Sioux Falls College, Sioux Falls.

WEST VIRGINIA

Davis, John W., President, West Virginia State College, Institute.
 Gibson, A. J., State Supervisor of High Schools, Charleston.
 Gwinn, C. N., High School Principal, Hinton.

Hayes, Augustus W., Professor of Sociology, Marshall College, Huntington.
 Hudelson, Earl, Dean of College of Education, West Virginia University, Morgantown.
 Hull, B. H., Principal, Logan High School, Logan.
 Rohr, H. D., Principal, Weston High School, Weston.
 Perdue, Dan H., State Supervisor of High Schools, State Department of Education, Charleston.
 Woolery, W. R., Dean of Faculty, Bethany College, Bethany.

WISCONSIN

Finnegan, (Rev.) Thomas A., Principal, Marquette University High School, Milwaukee.
 Balzer, G. J., Principal, Washington High School, Milwaukee.
 Barne, O. G., Principal, West High School, Madison.
 Briggs, Lucia R., President, Milwaukee-Downer College, Milwaukee.
 Davidson, R. P., Superintendent, Northwestern Military and Naval Academy, Lake Geneva.
 Evans, Silas, President, Ripon College, Ripon.
 Fitzpatrick, Edward A., President, Mount Mary College, Milwaukee.
 Friedl, J. C., Principal, Champion High School, Prairie du Chien.
 Ganfield, W. W., President, Carroll College, Waukesha.
 Grace, W. J., Dean of College of Liberal Arts, Marquette University, Milwaukee.
 Graham, Dean, Ripon College, Ripon.
 Grinnell, J. E., Director, Liberal Arts Department, Stout Institute, Menomonie.
 Helble, Herbert H., Principal, Appleton High School, Appleton.
 Hill, J. D., President, Superior State Teachers College, Superior.
 Holt, H. H., Dean, St. John's Military Academy, Delafield.
 Hulten, C. E., Advisory Member, Sheboygan High School, Sheboygan.
 Jones, T. J., Supt. of Schools, West Allis.
 Keefe, (Rev.) Anselm M., Dean, St. Norbert College, West DePere.
 Kennedy, Bernard A., Principal, Prairie du Chien High School, Prairie du Chien.
 Lazenby, John C., Director of Secondary Education, State Teachers College, Milwaukee.
 McGinley, John R., Superintendent, Our Lady of Lourdis High School, Marinette.
 Maurer, Irving, President, Beloit College, Beloit.
 Mother Mary Ferdinand, Dean, Mount Mary College, Milwaukee.

Polk, Forrest R., President, State Teachers College, Oshkosh.

Quinn, B. J., President, Campion High School, Prairie du Chien.

Rahn, Grant, Principal, Shorewood Junior-Senior High School, Milwaukee.

Randle, Foster S., Principal, East High School, Madison.

Rasche, William F., Principal, Milwaukee Vocational School, Milwaukee.

Raymond, Anna A., Principal, Milwaukee-Downer Seminary, Milwaukee.

Ryan, H. H., Principal, Wisconsin High School, Madison.

Sister M. Jannarius, School Supervisor, St. Clara College, Sinsinawa.

Sister M. Josina, Principal, Cathedra High School, Superior.

Sister M. Mildred, Teacher, Aquinas High School, La Crosse.

Sister M. Paschala, Prioress, St. Clara Academy, Sinsinawa.

Sister M. Rosina, Teacher, St. Rose Convent High School, La Crosse.

Sister M. Teresina, Supervisor, De Padua High School, Ashland.

Sister Mary Eugene, Principal, St. Mary's Academy, Prairie du Chien.

Sister Mary Frances, Assistant Dean, Mt. Mary College, Milwaukee.

Sister Mary Ludgarde, Acting Principal, St. Joseph's Academy, Stevens Point.

Sister Mary Melita, Dean of Women, Mt. Mary College, Milwaukee.

Sister Wilberta, Registrar, Mt. Mary College, Milwaukee.

Snodgrass, G. M., President, La Crosse Teachers College, La Crosse.

Towne, Milton C., Assistant to the President, Lawrence College, Appleton.

West, R. O., Principal, West Allis High School, West Allis.

Willing, M. H., Professor of Education, University of Wisconsin, Madison.

Worthington, J. E., Principal, Waukesha High School, Waukesha.

Wriston, Henry M., President, Lawrence College, Appleton.

WYOMING

Maxwell, C. R., Dean of College of Education, University of Wyoming, Laramie.

OTHER STATES

Burnett, Andrew K., Auditor, Presbyterian Board of Christian Education, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

Huntley, M. C., Executive Secretary, Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, Birmingham, Alabama.

Hurd, A. W., Institute of School Experimentation, Teachers College Columbia University, New York City.

Johnson, Mayrell (Miss), Instructor and Assistant to Registrar, Murray State Teachers College, Murray, Kentucky.

Kent, R. A., President, University of Louisville, Louisville, Kentucky.

MacCracken, John H., Associate Director, American Council on Education, Washington, D.C.

O'Rear, F. B., Associate Professor of Education, Teachers' College, Columbia University, New York City.

Rainey, Homer P., President, Bucknell University, Lewisburg, Pennsylvania.

Sister M. Angelina, Supervising Principal, Loretta Abbey, Toronto, Canada.

Sister M. Margarita, Dean, Loretto Abbey College, Toronto, Canada.

Wilson, Thomas J. Jr., Dean of Admissions, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, North Carolina.